989

United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1989

S 1.70/8:

READEX FICHE best copy available

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 9806

Bureau of International Organization Affairs

Released December 1990

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government
Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1989

Contents

Acronyms and Short Forms xv

PART 1. POLITICAL AND SECURITY AFFAIRS

- Security Council 1
- General Assembly 3
- Peaceful Settlement 5
  - Middle East 5
    - Security Council Consideration 5
      - Situation in the Occupied Territories 5
      - Lebanon 8
      - UN Interim Force in Lebanon 11
      - UN Disengagement Observer Force 12
    - General Assembly Consideration 12
      - Israeli Credentials 12
      - Situation in the Middle East 12
      - Question of Palestine 14
      - Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories. 17
      - UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East 19
      - Assistance to the Palestinian People 21
      - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States 22
  - Observer Status for the Council of Europe 23
  - Conflict Between Iran and Iraq 23
    - Security Council Consideration 23
    - General Assembly Consideration 25
  - Afghanistan 25
  - Cambodia 26
    - Credentials at the General Assembly 26
    - General Assembly Consideration 26
  - South African Policies of Apartheid 27
    - General Assembly Consideration 27
      - Special Session of the General Assembly on Apartheid 32
  - Other African Questions 34
    - Comorian Island of Mayotte 34
    - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity 34
  - Hostage-Taking 35
  - Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question 35
  - Panama 35
    - Security Council Consideration 35

        - General Assembly Consideration 37
    - Situation in Central America 37
        - Security Council Consideration 37
            - Esquipulas II and Related Accords 37
            - UN Mission for the Verification of the Elections in Nicaragua 38
            - International Commission for Support and Verification 39
            - UN Observer Group in Central America 41
            - Resolution 637 42
            - Security Council President's Statement of December 8 43
        - General Assembly Consideration 44
            - ICJ Decision on Nicaragua 44
            - U.S. Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua 44
        - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Latin American Economic System 45
    - Cyprus 45
- Disarmament and Arms Control 46
    - UN Disarmament Commission 46
    - Conference on Disarmament 50
        - *Ad Hoc* Committees 51
            - Negative Security Assurances 51
            - Chemical Weapons 51
            - Comprehensive Program of Disarmament 52
            - Outer Space Arms Control 52
        - Other Issues 53
            - Nuclear Test Ban 53
            - Prevention of Nuclear War, Including All Related Matters 53
            - Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament 54
            - Membership 54
    - General Assembly Consideration 54
        - First Committee Disarmament Issues 55
        - Prevention of Nuclear War 58
        - Radiological Weapons 58
        - Disarmament and Development 59
        - Institutional Issues 60
        - Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations 62
        - Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons 63
        - Nuclear Freeze 64
        - Chemical and Biological Weapons 65
        - Comprehensive Test Ban 66
        - Cut-Off of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes 68
        - World Disarmament Campaign 68

- Reduction of Military Budgets 69
- Negative Security Assurances 70
- Comprehensive Program of Disarmament 72
- Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones 73
    - Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco 73
    - African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 74
    - Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 76
    - South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 76
    - South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone 77
- Indian Ocean Zone of Peace 77
- South Atlantic Zone of Peace 79
- Israeli Nuclear Armament 80
- Verification and Compliance 81
- Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space 82

Antarctica 83

Outer Space 85
- UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space 85
    - Scientific and Technical Subcommittee 85
    - Legal Subcommittee 86
- General Assembly Consideration 86

Law of the Sea 87

General Political Problems 89
- Membership 89
- Question of Peacekeeping 89
    - Peacekeeping Committee 89
    - General Assembly 90
- Efforts Toward Strengthening the Role of the United Nations 90
    - Charter Committee 90
    - General Assembly 91
- Questions Relating to Information 92

PART 2. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC AND HUMAN RIGHTS AFFAIRS

Introduction 95

Economic and Development Activities 97
- The Critical Economic Situation in Africa 97
- Emergency Assistance to Somalia, Sudan and Countries Affected by Hurricane Hugo 98
- International Assistance for the Economic Rehabilitation of Angola 98
- International Development Strategy 99
- Long-Term Trends in Economic Development 99
- Economic Commission for Europe 100
- Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific 102

    Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean 103
    Economic Commission for Africa 105
    Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia 106
    UN Development Program 106
        Governing and Advisory Bodies 107
        Secretariat and Field Organization 108
        Program Development 109
            Patterns of Development Assistance 109
            Activities and Analysis 109
        UN Volunteers 111
    General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 112
        Fundamentals of GATT 113
        The Uruguay Round 114
    UN Conference on Trade and Development 115
    Substantial New Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries 117
    Commission on Transnational Corporations 117
        Code of Conduct 118
    UN Children's Fund 118
        Programs 119
        The Child Survival and Development Revolution 120
        1989 Session of the UNICEF Executive Board 121
        UNICEF and the World Summit for Children 123
        Funding 124
        U.S. Presence in UNICEF 124
        Expenditures in the United States 125
    Human Settlements Activities 125
    Population Activities 126
    The World Food Council 128
Social Issues 129
    Crime Prevention and Control 129
    Committee on Crime Prevention and Control 130
    Drug Abuse Control 130
        UN Drug Control Agencies 131
            Division of Narcotic Drugs 131
            UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control 131
            International Narcotics Control Board 132
        Commission on Narcotic Drugs 132
        ECOSOC Consideration 133
        General Assembly Consideration 134
            Global Program of Action 135
            Special Session on Narcotics 136
    Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator 138
        Reform of UNDRO 139

        - UNDRO Activities in 1989 139
        - National Emergency Relief Services III 140
        - International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction 140
    - UN High Commissioner for Refugees 141
        - International Legal Protection 141
        - General Assembly 142
        - UNHCR Programs 143
            - Africa 143
            - Asia 143
            - Europe and North America 144
            - Latin America 145
            - Southwest Asia, North Africa and the Middle East 145
    - Social Development 146
        - World Social Situation 146
        - Aging and Elderly 146
        - Disabled 146
        - Youth. 147
        - Family 147
- Science, Technology and Research 147
    - UN Environment Program 147
        - Governing Council 148
        - Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol 149
        - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 150
        - Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste 150
        - Biological Diversity 150
        - Regional Seas 151
        - UNEP in the General Assembly 151
    - UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation 151
    - New and Renewable Sources of Energy 153
    - Science and Technology for Development 153
    - UN University 156
    - University for Peace 156
    - UN Institute for Training and Research 156
        - Background and Structure 156
        - UNITAR in 1989 158
        - UN General Assembly 158
- Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 159
    - Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba 159
    - Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance 161
    - Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East 161
    - Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa 162

  - Self-Determination 164
  - Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 166
  - Free Elections 168
  - Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment 169
  - Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments... 171
    - Rights of the Child 172
    - Human Rights of Migrant Workers 172
    - Human Rights Defenders 173
    - Rights of Minorities 173
  - Youth and Human Rights 173
  - Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities 174
  - Violations of Human Rights 176
  - Human Rights in Chile 180
  - Advisory Services 181
  - Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination 181
  - Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights... 182
  - Regional Arrangements 183
  - Science and Technology 183
  - Enlargement of the Human Rights Commission 183
  - Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities 184
  - Status of Women 185
    - Commission on the Status of Women 186
    - First Regular Session of ECOSOC 188
    - Second Regular Session of ECOSOC 189
    - General Assembly Consideration 190
- Specialized Agencies and the IAEA 191
  - UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).... 191
    - Introduction 191
    - UNIDO Meetings 192
    - Activities in 1989 192
      - Program and Budget Committee 192
      - Industrial Development Board 193
      - Third General Conference 193
      - Industrial Development Board: Third Special Session 195
    - Investment Promotion Service 195
  - World Bank Group 195
    - IBRD and IDA Lending Program 196
    - Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency 197
    - International Finance Corporation 197
  - International Monetary Fund (IMF) 197

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 199
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 201
    FAO Council 202
    FAO Conference 202
    Other Meetings 203
    The World Food Program 204
        The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs 205
UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 206
    UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 208
    Universal Copyright Convention 209
    Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission 209
    International Geological Correlation Program 211
    Man and the Biosphere Program 212
    World Heritage Committee 213
    U.S. National Commission for UNESCO 213
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) 213
    Administrative Organization 214
    Technical Activities 215
    Assistance to Developing Countries 215
    Revision of the Paris Convention 215
    Patent Cooperation Treaty 216
    Brussels Satellite Convention 216
    Adherence to Berne Convention 216
    Registration of Audiovisual Works 217
    Protection of Integrated Circuits 217
World Health Organization (WHO) 218
    U.S. Participation 218
    Health Issues 220
        Primary Health Care 221
        AIDS 221
        Malaria and the Control of Vectors 222
        Guinea Worm Disease 222
        Immunization 222
        Purchase and Sale of Human Organs 222
        Tobacco 223
        Other Health Topics 223
    Administrative and Budgetary Issues 223
        Adoption of Program Budget for 1990–1991 223
        Budget Reform 224
        Exchange Rate Fluctuation 224
        Real Estate Requirements 224

Scale of Assessments 225
Payment of Assessments 225
Suspension of the Vote 225
U.S. Government Payments 226
Tribute to Furth 226
Political Issues 227
PLO Application for Membership 227
Action Regarding Israel 229
African Resolutions 230
Pan American Health Organization 230
International Agency for Research on Cancer 231
International Maritime Organization (IMO) 232
Assembly 232
Council 233
Maritime Safety Committee 234
Legal Committee 234
Marine Environment Protection Committee 235
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) 235
Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against Civil Aviation 236
Other Assembly Action 237
Iran Air 655 Incident 238
ICAO Statistics Division 238
ICAO Regional Air Navigation Meeting 239
Continuing Airworthiness Panel 239
International Telecommunication Union (ITU) 240
Administrative Council, 44th Session 240
Plenipotentiary Conference 240
Political Issues 241
The Mideast 241
Southern Africa 242
Cuba 242
Structural Issues 242
Administrative Matters 243
Technical Assistance 244
Future Conferences 245
Elections 245
Final Acts 246
Administrative Council, 45th Session 247
Opening Session 247
Extraordinary Session on High-Level Study of the ITU 247
Center for Telecommunications Development 248
ITU Technical Bodies 249
International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee 249

        - International Radio Consultative Committee 250
        - International Frequency Registration Board 250
- Universal Postal Union (UPU) 250
    - Executive Council 251
    - Consultative Council for Postal Studies 251
    - Twentieth Congress of the UPU 251
- International Labor Organization (ILO) 252
    - Governing Body 252
        - Financial Issues 252
        - Election of Director General 253
    - ILO Annual Conference 253
        - Financial Issues 255
        - Technical Committees 256
        - Committee on the Application of Standards 257
        - Resolutions Committee 257
        - Credentials Committee 258
        - Committee on Action Against Apartheid 258
        - Other Issues 258
    - U.S. Action on ILO Conventions 259
- World Meteorological Organization (WMO) 259
    - Organization 259
    - Major Program Activities 260
        - World Weather Watch 260
        - World Climate Program 260
        - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 261
        - Applications of Meteorology 261
        - Hydrology and Water Resources Program 261
        - Research and Development 262
        - Technical Cooperation 262
    - Cooperation with the United Nations and Other International Organizations 262
    - Financial Matters 262
        - Voluntary Cooperation Program 263
    - Internal Matters of the Executive Council 263
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) 263
    - General Background 264
    - IAEA Programs 265
        - Safeguards 265
        - Nuclear Energy and Safety 266
        - Technical Assistance and Cooperation 267
        - Research and Isotopes 268
    - Special Issues 269
        - Environment 269

Liability for Nuclear Damage 270
Dumping of Nuclear Wastes 271
Political Issues 271
Israeli Nuclear Activities 271
PLO Participation 272
South African Membership 272
Budgetary Matters 272
General Assembly 273

PART 3. TRUSTEESHIP AND DEPENDENT AREAS

Introduction 275
Trusteeship Council 276
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands 277
U.S. Territories 278
Special Committee Consideration 278
American Samoa 278
Guam 279
U.S. Virgin Islands 279
General Assembly Action 280
Namibia 280
Peacekeeping 280
Implementation of Resolution 435, the
Downsizing Debate and Deployment .. 281
The Impartiality Package 283
U.S. Airlift Assistance for UNTAG 284
UNTAG's Military Contingent 285
Repatriation of Namibians by UNHCR and the
Issue of SWAPO Detainees 285
The SWAPO Detainees 286
Security and Intimidation Issues 287
The April Fool's Invasion 287
Police Monitors Increased 290
The Code of Conduct 290
Legal and Electoral Arrangements 292
Amnesty, Repressive Legislation and
Release of Prisoners 292
The Constitutional Principles 293
Voter Registration 293
The Parties 293
The Electoral Code 294
The Fluorescent Ink 294
The Elections and Their Aftermath 294
U.S. Presidential Delegation 295
Announcement of Results 295
The Constituent Assembly 296
Puerto Rico 296
Western Sahara 297

- New Caledonia 298
- Other Questions 298
  - Fourth Committee Resolutions 298
  - Plenary Action 299

PART 4. LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Introduction 301
- International Terrorism 301
- International Court of Justice 302
  - Nicaragua v. United States of America 303
  - Mazilu Case 303
  - Iran v. United States of America 303
- International Law Commission 304
  - Work of the Commission's 41st Session 304
  - General Assembly Action 306
- UN Commission on International Trade Law 306
  - International Law Conventions 306
    - Draft UN Convention on Transport Terminals 306
    - UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sales of Goods 307
  - UNCITRAL's 1989 Work Program 307
    - Model Law on Procurement 307
    - Model Law on International Credit Transfers 308
    - Model Law on International Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit 308
    - Legal Guide for International Countertrade Contracts 308
    - Coordination of Work by International Bodies 309
- Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind 309
- International Convention Against Mercenary Activities 310
- Peace, Security and International Cooperation 311
- Strengthening International Security 312
- Host Country Relations 314
- Development of Principles Concerning International Economic Order 315
- International Criminal Court 315
- Draft Articles on the Diplomatic Courier and Bag 316
- UN Decade of International Law 317

PART 5. BUDGET, ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

- Introduction 319
- UN Reform 321
- Current Financial Crisis of the United Nations 323
- UN Budget 325

Audit Reports 327
Financing Peacekeeping Operations 330
Scales of Assessment 334
Committee for Program and Coordination 336
    Proposed UN Program Budget for 1990–1991 337
    Program Performance for 1987–1988 338
    Program Coordination 339
    Review of Evaluation Activities 339
    Cross-Organizational Program Analyses 341
Joint Inspection Unit 342
Committee on Conferences 345
International Civil Service Commission 348
Personnel Questions 349
UN Pension System 350
Employment of Americans 351

APPENDICES

1. Address by President Bush at the 44th Regular Session of the General Assembly 355
2. Principal Organs of the United Nations 363
    General Assembly 363
    Security Council 366
    Trusteeship Council 366
    Economic and Social Council 366
    International Court of Justice 367
3. U.S. Missions 369
    U.S. Mission to the United Nations, New York 1989 369
    U.S. Mission to the European Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations, Geneva 370
    Other U.S. Missions 371
4. United States Representatives 373
    General Assembly 373
    Security Council 375
    Trusteeship Council 375
    Economic and Social Council and Related Bodies 375
    Specialized Agencies and IAEA 378
5. Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations 381

Acronyms and Short Forms

AID	U.S. Agency for International Development
ACABQ	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
ACC	Administrative Committee on Coordination
Committee of 24	Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
CD	Conference on Disarmament
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
EC	European Community
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
ESCWA	Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
G–77	Group of 77
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
NASA	U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAS	Organization of American States
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
UNCITRAL	UN Commission of International Trade Law
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNDC	UN Disarmament Commission

UNDOF	UN Disengagement Observer Force
UNDP	UN Development Program
UNEF	UN Emergency Force
UNEP	UN Environment Program
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFICYP	UN Force in Cyprus
UNHCR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organization
UNIFIL	UN Interim Force in Lebanon
UNITAR	UN Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA	UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNSCEAR	UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

Part 1

Political and Security Affairs

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, its primary purpose has been the promotion of international peace and security. This remains the centerpiece of the UN system.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Charter gives the Security Council primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The Charter authorizes the Council to act to achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes (Chapter VI), and to deal with threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression (Chapter VII). The Council can only make recommendations for actions on matters raised under Chapter VI. In areas covered by Chapter VII, however, it may take decisions which are binding on all member states—including the imposition of collective, political, economic and military sanctions.

The 15-member Council meets as necessary. The Charter gives a special role to the five Permanent Members—France, China, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States. Security Council decisions on substantive matters (usually in the form of a draft resolution) require the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the Council, though a negative vote by a Permanent Member constitutes a veto of any such decision. Council decisions on procedural matters also require at least nine affirmative votes for adoption. They cannot be vetoed, but in these instances, the Council often operates by consensus.

The 10 non-permanent members are elected by the General Assembly and traditionally represent geographic regions. They serve overlapping 2-year terms: five members are elected each year. The 10 non-permanent members in 1989 were: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Finland, Malaysia, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia. They five new members for the 1990–1991 term are Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire, replacing Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia.

The Council has created UN peacekeeping and peace-monitoring operations in order to help carry out its responsibilities. Twelve such units existed in 1989: the UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP); the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria; the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), stationed in southern Lebanon; the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) based in Jerusalem; the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP); the UN Iran–Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) located in Iran and Iraq; the UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP); the UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) located in Namibia; the UN Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM) in Angola; the UN Mission for the Verification of Elections in Nicaragua (ONUVEN); the UN Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA), located in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras; and the International Commission for Support and Verification (CIAV), located in Nicaragua, with activities in Costa Rica and Honduras. CIAV did not, however, actually carry out any activities in 1989.

The Security Council held 69 meetings in 1989, compared with 55 in 1988. Most of these meetings concerned the Middle East and southern Africa. The Council adopted 20 of the 25 resolutions considered (20 were also adopted in 1988), 18 of them unanimously. The United States voted against (vetoed) 5, and abstained on 2 of the 25 resolutions.

The Security Council extended the following UN peacekeeping forces or observer groups into 1990: UNFICYP (Resolutions 634 and 646), UNIFIL (Resolutions 630 and 639), UNDOF (Resolutions 633 and 645) and UNIIMOG (Resolutions 631 and 642). It adopted five resolutions on Namibia: one welcoming the tripartite agreement between Angola, Cuba, and South Africa and the bilateral Angolan-Cuban agreement (Resolution 628); one setting April 1, 1989, as the date for implementation of resolution 435 of 1978 (Resolution 635); and three dealing with the implementation process. (Resolutions 632, 640 and 643.)

On Central American issues, the Security Council adopted resolution 644 authorizing the establishment of ONUCA, a complex operation to assist Central American governments in achieving goals set forth in the 1987 Guatemala Agreement and subsequent joint declarations.

On terrorism issues, the Security Council unanimously adopted a U.K.-initiated resolution on plastic and sheet explosives. (Resolution 635.) The resolution arose in part out of the terrorist attack on Pan Am Flight 103 which crashed in Scotland in December 1988. Following reports of the execution of U.S. Lt. Col. William Higgins, a UN military observer serving with UNIFIL, the Council in July adopted resolution 638, unequivocally condemning hostage-taking and abduction.

On the Israeli-occupied territories, the United States abstained on two resolutions adopted by the Council condemning deportation of Palestinians by Israel. (Resolutions 636 and 641.) During the course of debate on these resolutions, the United States criticized the deportation of eight Palestinians by Israel to Lebanon, while noting the difficult strains placed on Israeli security by the Palestinian uprising and the need to get the negotiating process started. In addition, the United States reiterated its opposition to deportations, while emphasizing that continued recourse to the Council would neither address the underlying problems nor facilitate negotiations.

The United States vetoed three other draft resolutions dealing with Israel and the occupied territories. Sponsored by the non-aligned members of the Council (Algeria, Colombia, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia), they were supported by the 14 other Security Council members. The United States viewed the draft resolutions as one-sided and unbalanced, condemning Israeli policies and practices without reference to serious acts of violence by the other side.

In January the United States, joined by France and the United Kingdom, vetoed a Libyan draft resolution criticizing the United States for shooting down two Libyan aircraft. Canada also voted against the draft, while Brazil and Finland abstained.

In late December, the United States also vetoed a draft resolution introduced by the non-aligned members of the Council which would have deplored U.S. intervention in Panama. The United States was joined by the United Kingdom, France and Canada in opposing the draft resolution; Finland abstained, while the remaining 10 Council members voted in favor.

On six occasions in 1989, the Security Council voted on requests by the PLO observer delegation to participate in Council debates. The United States opposed such requests on the grounds that they were not valid; under Council rules, any request to participate must be made by a UN member state on the observer's behalf. Each time the request was approved, with only the United States opposed, while Canada, France and the United Kingdom abstained.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Except for the anomalous situation of the Delegation of South Africa, whose credentials have not been accepted since 1970, all UN member states are currently represented in the General Assembly. The Assembly meets annually from mid-September to mid-December. After 3 weeks of general debate, the work of the Assembly takes place in seven main committees and in plenary. Political issues are handled in several fora: arms control and disarmament in the First Committee; broad political issues in the Special Political Committee and the plenary; human rights in the Third Committee; dependent territories and decolonization questions in the Fourth Committee; budgetary matters in the Fifth Committee; and legal questions in the Sixth Committee.

The 44th General Assembly convened on September 19, and was suspended on December 29, after holding 88 plenary sessions. It adopted a total of 331 resolutions, of which 215 (65 percent) were by consensus, and 60 decisions, of which 57 (95 percent) were by consensus. A total of 143 votes were taken on 116 resolutions, 21 separate paragraphs, 3 procedural issues, and 3 decisions. Of these, the United States voted "yes" 14 times, "no" 95 times, abstained 32 times and did not participate in 2 votes.

The General Assembly reflected the improved tenor of international relations and increased concern with such issues as respect for human rights, narcotics, terrorism and the environment that this trend engendered. It provided the scene for a concrete chemical arms control proposal by President Bush on October 25, which received a positive response from Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze the following day.

Major issues covered by the General Assembly continued to revolve around Middle East and southern African questions, along with Afghanistan and Cambodia. A new joint U.S.-Soviet resolution on peace, security and international cooperation also reflected the interest of both powers in finding constructive solutions to world problems, underscoring the UN framework.

On Middle East issues, highlights included record support for deferral of the challenge to Israeli credentials, including a switch from a vote against deferral to an abstention by the U.S.S.R. and its European allies. PLO attempts to enhance its status in the United Nations were also deferred. However, in the U.S. view, almost all resolutions dealing with Middle East matters are one-sided and unhelpful to the peace process.

The Assembly adopted by large margins 32 resolutions on Middle East issues, most importantly, 3 dealing with the general situation in the region, 4 on the question of Palestine, 7 on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, 11 on UNRWA and 2 on the Palestinian uprising (*intifada*). The United States voted against or abstained on nearly all Middle East resolutions because their lack of balance and strident tone did not promote the quest for a just and lasting peace in the region.

On Afghanistan, a consensus resolution called for implementation of the Geneva agreement, welcomed completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal, reaffirmed the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government, and called upon all parties to work to achieve a comprehensive political solution. A record number of votes also reaffirmed the need for a comprehensive political settlement in Cambodia and opposition to the return to power of the Khmer Rouge.

On terrorism, a strengthened resolution containing a more unequivocal condemnation and eliminating loopholes for "national liberation struggles" helped reestablish the international consensus on that issue.

On southern Africa, the special session on apartheid passed by consensus a declaration on apartheid—a first for the United Nations on that subject. While the tone of apartheid resolutions enacted during the regular General Assembly session was somewhat improved, they did not adequately reflect the changing circumstances in South Africa.

The General Assembly adopted by consensus a U.S.-Soviet joint resolution on peace, security and international cooperation. The measure—the first joint U.S.-Soviet resolution in the General Assembly—reaffirmed the commitment of member states to use the United Nations and its various organs to enhance international peace and security. It was offered in place of earlier resolutions on "comprehensive security" which had been sponsored by the U.S.S.R. but strongly opposed by the United States.

In late December, after the United States vetoed a Security Council resolution condemning U.S. intervention in Panama, Cuba and Nicaragua brought a similar resolution to the General Assembly. This resolution passed, but less than half the membership voted for it, while a large number of states abstained or were absent. Over strong U.S. objections, the General Assembly again passed a resolution calling for U.S. compliance with the 1986 International Court of Justice decision in the Nicaragua case and another resolution criticizing the U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua.

U.S.-sponsored resolutions on such issues as compliance with arms control agreements, periodic and genuine elections, the promotion of women in the UN Secretariat, and a moratorium on large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing were all adopted by consensus.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Middle East

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Situation in the Occupied Territories

Against the backdrop of continuing unrest in the West Bank and Gaza sparked by the Palestinian uprising (*intifada*) that began in December 1987, the Security Council met to consider the situation in the occupied territories on several occasions during 1989. Five draft resolutions were considered; two were adopted and three others failed because of negative votes by a Permanent Member (U.S.).

In January the PLO submitted a letter to the Security Council President protesting a recent series of Israeli security measures in the occupied territories. The PLO cited shootings, the imposition of curfews, demolition of homes and expulsions. At the urging of several non-aligned members, the

Council President proposed that a statement be issued on behalf of the entire Council calling on Israel to comply fully with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, and noting that the situation had grave consequences for prospects of achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. After several days of negotiations, however, it became evident on January 31 that members could not reach agreement on a text because the statement did not call for restraint by both Israel and the Palestinians.

On February 7 the PLO sent a letter to the Security Council President protesting additional Israeli security measures in the occupied territories and noting the increasing number of Palestinian casualties. On February 8 the Arab group requested an urgent meeting to consider the situation in the occupied territories. A draft resolution, sponsored by the non-aligned, called on Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention and deplored Israel's "violation of human rights, and in particular the opening of fire that has resulted in injuries and deaths of Palestinian civilians, including children."

On February 17 the United States vetoed the draft, 14 to 1 (U.S.). In an explanation of vote, Ambassador Okun reaffirmed the U.S. position that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the occupied territories, and that Israel has an obligation to comply therewith. The United States has made clear to the Government of Israel U.S. concerns where there is disagreement with Israeli practices, i.e., expulsion of Palestinian residents and use of live fire in non-life threatening situations. He said, however, that the draft was flawed in that while it severely criticized Israeli policies and practices, it did not take into account sufficiently the context in which they occurred or the excesses of the other side. "Palestinian acts of violence, no more than those committed by Israelis, cannot be condoned."

On April 13 Israeli Armed Forces in the West Bank village of Nahalin opened fire on Palestinian protesters, killing 4 and wounding 27. The PLO sent a letter to the Secretary General the same day protesting the Israeli action and suggesting that the Security Council provide physical protection for Palestinian people under Israeli occupation. At the urging of several non-aligned members, the Council President proposed that a statement be issued on behalf of the entire Council calling on Israel to abide by its international obligations and exercise maximum restraint in the occupied territories. However, it became evident on April 17 that members could not reach agreement on a text. Instead, the Arab Group called for a resumed meeting of the General Assembly to adopt General Assembly resolution 43/233 on the issue.

On April 27 the PLO sent a letter to the President of the Security Council noting that General Assembly resolution 43/233 requested the Council to consider with urgency the situation in the occupied territories with a view to considering international protection to Palestinian civilians. The Council President proposed that a statement be issued on behalf of the entire Council expressing grave concern about the continuing deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories and calling on Israel to abide immediately and scrupulously by the Fourth Geneva Convention. After many days of negotiations, however, it became evident on May 22 that members could not reach agreement on a text because the statement failed to call for restraint by both Israel and the Palestinians, to call upon Palestinians to do their part to ease tensions, or to refer to a negotiated settlement on the basis of Council resolutions 242 and 338.

On May 31 the Arab group agreed at the PLO's urging to request an immediate meeting to consider the situation in the occupied territories, particularly violence by Israeli settlers against Palestinians. A draft resolution, sponsored by the non-aligned, called on Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention, and deplored those policies and practices of Israel which violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territory, and in particular vigilante attacks against Palestinian towns and villages and the desecration of the holy Koran.

On June 9 the United States vetoed the draft, 14 to 1 (U.S.). In explanation of vote, Ambassador Pickering reaffirmed the U.S. position that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the occupied territories, and that Israel has an obligation to abide by its responsibilities as the occupying power. He said:

> We deplore the bloodshed that has occurred in the occupied territories. We appeal again to all parties to refrain from acts of violence. The recent escalation in attacks by Israeli settlers against unarmed Palestinians is an especially disturbing development. So, too, is the increase in violence committed by Palestinians against other Palestinians suspected of cooperation with Israeli authorities . . . . We cannot, however, support this draft because it is unbalanced. It makes sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices without any reference to any of the serious acts of violence by the other side . . . . Most specifically, the text does not condemn violence from all quarters, and it omits any call for mutual restraint and respect which can help to reduce tensions.

On June 29 the Israeli Government deported to Lebanon eight Palestinian residents of the territories accused of inciting violence. In response, the Security Council on July 6 voted (14 to 0 with 1 abstention (U.S.)) to adopt resolution 636. This resolution, sponsored by the non-aligned group, reaffirmed the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the occupied territories, regretted the continuing deportation by Israel of Palestinian civilians, and called upon Israel to ensure the safe and immediate return of those deported and to desist from deporting any other Palestinian civilians.

In explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Pickering said that the United States is opposed to deportations as a contravention of Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention. "We also consider deportations unnecessary to maintain order and unhelpful to the peace process." In addition, he said,

> . . . we do not believe, however, that raising the issue in the Council now, in the form in which it is being presented will help to reduce tensions or to restore calm. Neither,

> unfortunately, do we believe a resolution will assist in achieving the cessation of the deportations, which we continue to oppose.

When Israel deported another four Palestinians to Lebanon on August 27, the Security Council met again to consider another non-aligned draft resolution. On August 30 the Council voted (14 to 0 with 1 abstention (U.S.)) to adopt resolution 641, with essentially the same text as resolution 636. Ambassador Pickering, noting that the U.S. position on the issue had been made clear in our vote on resolution 636, reiterated U.S. opposition to deportations as contrary to the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention which apply to the occupied territories. However, he also said that the United States does not believe that repeated resort to the Security Council will help address the underlying problems of finding peace or facilitate negotiations between the parties.

The PLO sent a letter on October 20 to the Secretary General expressing concern about Israeli measures in response to the tax revolt by the inhabitants of the village of Beit Sahur in light of the General Assembly resolution of October 6 requesting the Security Council to examine urgently the situation in the occupied territories. When the United States rejected the draft proposed statement by the President of the Council as too one-sided to provide a serious basis for consideration, the non-aligned requested a Council meeting for debate and vote on a resolution. The non-aligned proposed a resolution that deplored the policies and practices of Israel which violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territory, particularly the siege of towns, ransacking of homes and the illegal and arbitrary confiscation of their property and valuables. The draft resolution called on Israel to desist from such practices, to return the confiscated property and called once again upon Israel to abide by the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

On November 7 the United States vetoed the draft, 14 to 1 (U.S.). In explanation of vote, Ambassador Pickering said:

> The United States is deeply distressed by the continuing violence and confrontation in the occupied territories. We have repeatedy called on all parties to exercise maximum restraint to avoid bloodshed and reduce tensions. We remain convinced that the situation in the occupied territories can only be resolved through a comprehensive negotiated settlement firmly based on UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, and which recognizes Israel's needs for secure and recognized boundaries and the legitimate rights of the Palestinians . . . . In our view, repeated recourse to the Security Council with one-sided draft resolutions does not contribute to this process, nor to a real reduction of confrontation in the occupied territories.

Lebanon

The unsettled situation in southern Lebanon continued to spawn incidents of violence throughout the year that prompted the Lebanese Government to submit letters to the Security Council President complaining about various Israeli activities in southern Lebanon, including military raids and allegations of intentions to expand the Israel-controlled security zone. However, the Council's attention was devoted to the serious situation elsewhere in Lebanon which several times erupted into violence with heavy armed conflict prompting Security Council consideration. Most serious was the outbreak of heavy shelling between the Lebanese Armed Forces under Maj. Gen. Michel Aoun in the Christian-controlled enclave and Syrian and Muslim Lebanese forces, especially in and around Beirut.

In March the situation in Lebanon became extremely serious. On March 31 the Security Council President issued a statement on behalf of the members, expressing grave concern at the many civilian victims and considerable material damage, as well as encouragement and support for all ongoing efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Lebanese crisis, notably by the Ministerial Committee of the League of Arab States led by Kuwait. The Council appealed for an immediate end to confrontations, an effective cease-fire and avoidance of actions that might heighten tension.

In April the serious situation in Lebanon once again became the subject of Security Council attention. On April 24 the Security Council President issued a statement on behalf of the members reaffirming their support for efforts by the Ministerial Committee of the League of Arab States led by Kuwait to put an end to the loss of human lives, to alleviate the sufferings of the Lebanese people and to achieve an effective cease-fire indispensible for a settlement of the Lebanese crisis.

Despite the call for a cease-fire by the League of Arab States on April 27, indiscriminate shelling of Beirut erupted again in May. The Secretary General expressed deep concern at the deterioration of the security situation in and around Beirut and the unrestrained shelling of the civilian population, and appealed to all involved in the fighting to adhere scrupulously to the cease-fire. On May 26 the League of Arab States meeting at Casablanca adopted a resolution to establish the Arab League Higher Committee on Lebanon, composed of the Arab Heads of State from Algeria, Morocco and Saudi Arabia, to seek a solution to the Lebanese crisis. The Higher Committee issued a communique on June 4 at Rabat outlining the fundamental principles of its approach in seeking a solution to the Lebanese crisis.

In August the violence in Lebanon once again became extremely serious. On August 15 the Security Council President issued a statement on behalf of the members, deploring the intensification of the shelling and bitter fighting, reaffirming their previous calls for an immediate cease-fire, and appealing for the opening of lines of communication and the lifting of sieges. The statement also expressed full support for the Arab League Higher Committee on Lebanon to seek a solution to the Lebanese crisis.

In September the Higher Committee issued a plan of action toward ending the Lebanese crisis and invited Lebanese parliamentarians to meet in Taif, Saudi Arabia, for the purpose of considering the elements of that plan. On September 20 the Security Council President issued a statement on behalf of the members expressing support for the efforts of the Higher Committee to stop the bloodshed and to establish an atmosphere conducive to ensuring security, stability and national reconciliation in Lebanon. The statement also expressed full support for the Tripartite Committee's action to put into effect a plan for the settlement of the Lebanese crisis in all its aspects by guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

In light of the absence of agreement to settle the Lebanese crisis, on October 1 the United States and the U.S.S.R. sent a joint letter to the Secretary General transmitting the text of their joint statement on Lebanon of September 23, expressing deep concern over the absence of peace and a settlement in Lebanon, reaffirming their urgent appeal for all necessary measures to bring to an end the sufferings caused by the Lebanese crisis, and welcoming the peacemaking mission of the Arab League Higher Committee. The statement emphasized that a constructive dialogue between Lebanese who themselves must reach lasting agreements on peaceful arrangements in Lebanon on the basis of a balance of interest is the only rational path towards reconciliation.

Following the agreement reached among members of the Lebanese Parliament in Taif on October 24 under the auspices of the Higher Committee on a process of peace and national conciliation for Lebanon, the five Permanent Members of the Security Council issued a statement on October 31 welcoming the agreement, calling upon all Lebanese to unite their efforts for its comprehensive implementation following its early ratification by the Lebanese Parliament, and expressing their determination to support, as the conclusion of the peace process, the restoration of the full sovereignty of Lebanon over the whole of its territory.

The Lebanese Parliament ratified the Taif Agreement on November 4 and elected President Rene Moawad on November 5. The President of the Security Council issued a statement on behalf of the Council members on November 7 expressing full support for the implementation of a settlement plan for the Lebanese crisis in all its aspects by guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon, and welcoming the election of the President of the Lebanese Republic and the ratification of the Taif Agreement. The statement urged all sectors of the Lebanese people, including the armed forces, to come to the support of their president in order to achieve peace, dignity and harmony, as well as the restoration of the unity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon on its entire territory.

Following the assassination of President Moawad on November 22, the President of the Security Council issued a statement on behalf of the members, expressing their deep indignation and dismay, expressing sympathy to the

Moawad family, the prime minister and people of Lebanon, and condemning the cowardly, criminal and terrorist attack upon the unity of Lebanon, the democratic process and the process of national reconciliation. The statement reaffirmed the Council's support for the efforts of the Arab League Higher Committee and for the Taif Agreement as the only basis for guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon. The statement reiterated the call of November 7 to all sectors of the Lebanese people to continue the process of achieving the goals of the restoration of the Lebanese state and the establishment of renovated institutions, and urged all Lebanese people to exercise restraint, to rededicate themselves to the urgent task of national reconciliation and to demonstrate their commitment to democratic processes.

In light of continued opposition to the implementation of the Taif Agreement from Maj. Gen. Michel Aoun in the Christian enclave, the Security Council met again in December to consider the Lebanese situation. On December 27 the Council President issued a statement on behalf of the members welcoming the election of Elias Hrawi as President of the Lebanese Republic, and supporting President Hrawi's efforts to deploy Lebanese Government forces to restore central government authority over all Lebanese territory. The statement called on the Lebanese people, in particular all Lebanese Government officials, civilian and military, to support their president and the constitutional process initiated at Taif to achieve peacefully the restoration of unity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon on its entire territory.

UN Interim Force in Lebanon

The Security Council discussed the peacekeeping operations of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) on two occasions during 1989 in conjunction with renewal of UNIFIL's 6-month mandate. On January 31 the Council voted to extend the mandate through July 31. On July 31 the Council met again to renew UNIFIL's mandate until January 31, 1990. Both votes were unanimous. The two resolutions (630 and 639) reiterated the Council's strong support for the "territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries" and called on all parties concerned "to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate," which, if effected, would, *inter alia,* involve extension of UNIFIL's deployment to the area along the Lebanese-Israeli border.

In his July report to the Council on UNIFIL, the Secretary General expressed regret that it had not been possible to make further progress in implementing Security Council resolution 425 (1978), i.e., "withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, the restoration of international peace and security and the reestablishment of the Lebanese Government's effective authority in the area." Nonetheless, he noted, UNIFIL "continues to play an important role in controlling the level of violence in a very volatile situation."

UN Disengagement Observer Force

The Council also met twice during the year to renew the 6-month mandate of the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) operating on the Golan Heights between Israeli and Syrian forces. Resolution 633, adopted May 30, extended UNDOF's mandate through November 30. The Council voted again on November 29 (Resolution 645) to renew the mandate through May 31, 1990. Both votes were unanimous. The resolutions called on the concerned parties to implement immediately UN Security Council resolution 338 (1973). In his May and November reports to the Council on UNDOF, the Secretary General noted:

> Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.

On both occasions the President of the Security Council issued a brief statement indicating that this observation by the Secretary General also reflected the view of the Council.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Israeli Credentials

As in previous years, the 44th General Assembly witnessed an Arab-sponsored challenge to Israel's credentials. During the plenary consideration of the first report of the Credentials Committee on October 17, the Arab group presented a motion that the recommendations of the Committee be accepted, except for those regarding the Delegation of Israel. Acting on behalf of the five Nordic countries, the Danish Representative moved formally under Rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure that action be deferred on the Arab amendment. (This was the eighth consecutive year that the Nordic group had initiated such action.) The Nordic motion was approved 95 (U.S.) to 37 with 15 abstentions, representing a record margin of victory, and with the Soviet Union abstaining for the first time instead of voting against the deferral motion. Having thus disposed of the challenge to Israeli credentials, the Assembly proceeded to adopt the first report of the Credentials Committee without a vote. (Resolution 44/5 A.)

Situation in the Middle East

The General Assembly debated the annual agenda item the "Situation in the Middle East" in two plenary sessions, November 27–28. On December 4 the three draft resolutions submitted under this item were adopted. Each was sponsored by Bahrain, Cuba and Mauritania. The United States voted against two of the resolutions and abstained on one.

The first draft resolution, A/44/L. 47, dealt with the occupied territories. Its 15 operative paragraphs differed little from the text adopted the previous year.

The resolution reaffirmed that just and lasting peace in the region could not be achieved without "the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem." It endorsed the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including "the right to return and the right to self-determination, national independence and the establishment of its independent sovereign state in Palestine." Deploring Israel's failure to comply with earlier resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the resolution declared Israel's annexation of Jerusalem null and void. It further condemned Israel's policies and practices against the Palestinian people in the territories, including expropriation and establishment of settlements. The text strongly condemned imposition of Israeli law in the Golan Heights. It called on all states to end any military, economic, financial and technical aid to Israel, and specifially condemned "increasing collaboration between Israel and the racist regime of South Africa."

The resolution again called for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under UN auspices, with the participation of the Permanent Members of the Security Council and all parties to the conflict, including the PLO as "the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people," on an equal footing. According to the text, this conference would have "full authority" to achieve a solution in accordance with relevant UN resolutions. The resolution called for setting up a preparatory committee of the Permanent Members of the Security Council to help convene such a conference.

The resolution, 44/40 A, was adopted by a vote of 109 to 18 (U.S.) with 31 abstentions. Many of our allies joined the United States in voting against the measure. The United States requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 10, which mentioned the United States by name and denounced various cooperative agreements between the United States and Israel. The assembly voted to retain the paragraph by a vote of 63 to 35 (U.S.) with 47 abstentions.

The second draft resolution, A/44/L. 48, specifically addressed the Golan Heights. Strongly condemning Israel for its failure to comply with relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the text declared that Israel's continuing occupation of the Golan constitutes "an act of aggression" under the provisions of the UN Charter and a continuing threat to international peace and security. The resolution determined that "Israel's record, policies and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving member state." It further called on all member states to suspend all military, economic, financial and technical assistance to Israel and to sever all diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with Israel. This resolution, 44/40 B, was approved by a vote of 84 to 22 (U.S.) with 49 abstentions. Again, many Western countries opposed the resolution.

The third draft, A/44/L. 49, concerned the status of Jerusalem. Its operative paragraphs declared Israel's annexation of the city "illegal and therefore null and void" and deplored the transfer of diplomatic missions to Jerusalem by some states in violation of Security Council resolution 378 (1980). The resolution, 44/40 C, was adopted by a vote of 147 to 2 with 7 abstentions (U.S.). Only Costa Rica and Israel voted no.

In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Pickering emphasized that for over 40 years the United States has been in the forefront of efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. He noted that the United States believes the only realistic means of achieving a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is through direct negotiations between the concerned parties based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338. He expressed U.S. regret that the draft resolutions—almost parallel renditions of those adopted in earlier years—offered only more rhetoric and accusations. Ambassador Pickering explained that the United States could not support resolutions 44/40 A and 44/40 B because they were "objectionable in tone and contained unbalanced, harsh condemnation of Israel." He added that 44/40 A "endorses an international peace conference on the Middle East, a concept we cannot support." Regarding resolution 44/40 C, Pickering explained that the United States abstained because "we believe that the status of Jerusalem should be determined by means of negotiations among the parties concerned and as part of an overall peace settlement."

Question of Palestine

On April 18 the General Assembly held a special resumed session to consider this item. The meeting was held at the request of the Arab group regarding an incident April 13 when Palestinians were killed and wounded by Israeli Armed Forces. Prior to the plenary meeting the Arab group tabled a draft resolution, A/43/L. 55, expressing shock at action by Israeli Armed Forces which resulted in killing and wounding Palestinian civilians in the town of Nahalin and condemning those policies and practices of Israel which violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. It further demanded that Israel abide by the provisions of the Geneva Conventions Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and requested the Security Council to consider measures to protect Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories. The resolution was approved by a vote of 129 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention. (Resolution 43/233.)

Ambassador Pickering explained that the United States would vote against the resolution because "one-sided, confrontational rhetoric" in the draft resolution "does not improve the situation on the ground or advance the prospects for peace in the region." Pickering emphasized, however, that the United States is saddened by the loss of life and injuries suffered on a daily basis in the occupied territories. He said that the Nahalin incident is a "particularly serious tragedy," and urged that "Israel make every effort to avoid the unwarranted use of lethal force in the West Bank and Gaza." Pickering noted that such incidents "set back efforts to create a positive atmosphere for dialogue and undermine the confidence needed to build toward peace."

On October 6 the General Assembly held a special plenary meeting to consider the uprising (*intifada*) of the Palestinian people. This meeting was held, at the request of the Arab group, in addition to the regularly scheduled debate on this item later in the General Assembly session. Prior to the plenary meeting the Arab group tabled a draft resolution condemning "Israel's persistent policies and practices violating the human rights of the Palestinian people" in the occupied territories and strongly deploring Israel's continued disregard of relevant decisions of the Security Council. It further demanded that Israel abide by the provisions of the Geneva Conventions Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and requested the Security Council to consider with urgency the situation in the occupied territories with a view to considering measures needed to provide international protection to the Palestinian civilians. The resolution was approved 140 to 2 (U.S.) with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 44/2.)

Ambassador Watson explained that the United States objected to the resolution because it presented "only a one-sided view of the difficult situation in the occupied territories," and that resolutions incorporating "unbalanced rhetoric do not help alleviate the conditions they purport to describe, nor do they make a practical contribution to resolving the underlying problems." Watson emphasized that U.S. opposition to the resolution should not be construed as indifference to the plight of the Palestinian people or the current situation in the territories. He noted that the United States firmly supported the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories and that we had criticized Israeli actions inconsistent with that Convention. He underscored that the end of conflict and bloodshed in the occupied territories can only be achieved through dialogue leading to a negotiated comprehensive peace settlement agreed to by all the parties on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.

The General Assembly debated the annual agenda item the "Question of Palestine" November 29 to December 1. On December 6 the three draft resolutions submitted under this item were adopted. Each was sponsored by Bangladesh, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal and the Ukrainian S.S.R.

The first draft resolution, A/44/L. 43, endorsed the efforts of the General Assembly's Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, a body that the United States has consistently opposed as serving the partisan political aims of the PLO. The Assembly voted 133 to 3 (U.S.) with 21 abstentions to adopt this measure as resolution 44/41 A.

The next draft, A/44/L. 44, dealt mainly with the UN Secretariat's Division for Palestinian Rights, another body opposed by the United States on grounds of partisanship toward the PLO. This text, expressing appreciation and support for the Division's work, was adopted (Resolution 44/41 B) by a vote of 133 to 3 (U.S.) with 20 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/44/L. 45 called on the Secretariat's Department of Public Information, in cooperation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to continue its special information program on the Question of Palestine, with particular emphasis on public opinion in Europe and North America. It was adopted by a vote of 136 to 3 (U.S.) with 17 abstentions. (Resolution 44/41 C.)

A fourth draft resolution tabled under this item, A/44/L. 51, called for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, "with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, on an equal footing, and the five Permanent Members of the Security Council." According to the text, this conference would be based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and "the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, primarily the right to self-determination." The resolution "affirmed" several principles required for the achievement of peace, including withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967 and dismantling of Israeli settlements in these territories. It further noted the "desire and endeavors to place the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, under the supervision of the United Nations for a limited period." This resolution, 44/42 A, was adopted by a vote of 152 to 3 (U.S.) with 1 abstention.

In explanation of vote, Ambassador Pickering expressed regret that the draft resolutions being considered failed to address the issues in a constructive manner and thus did nothing to advance the prospects for achieving a settlement. Rather, such resolutions "will only make it more difficult to bring the concerned parties together at the negotiating table." He noted that the resolution on convening an international conference, which purported to resolve in advance issues that must be resolved in negotiations, failed to address the centrality of direct negotiations between the parties. He reiterated U.S. opposition to any conference having the authority to impose a prescribed solution or overturn agreements reached between the parties.

Another draft resolution under this item, A/44/L. 50, addressed the status of the PLO in reference to the adoption of resolution 43/177 A (1988), which the United States had opposed, declared the designation "Palestine" should be used in place of the designation "Palestine Liberation Organization" in the UN system, without prejudice to the PLO's observer status. The draft proposed that the designation "Palestine" would be construed within the United Nations as the "State of Palestine." In light of strong opposition led by the United States to the United Nations recognizing Palestine as a state, the General

Assembly decided on December 6, at the request of the cosponsors, to defer action on the draft resolution.

Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories

The Special Political Committee took up consideration of the agenda item on Israeli practices November 20–22. As in previous years, seven draft resolutions sponsored by the Arab group were considered. On November 22 the Committee voted to approve all seven, forwarding them to the plenary with a recommendation that they be adopted. The United States voted against three of the resolutions and abstained on the other four. A brief summary of the resolutions follows.

Draft resolution A/44/L. 19 strongly condemned a long list of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, e.g., "ill-treatment and torture of children and minors under detention." It was approved by a vote of 93 to 2 (U.S.) with 31 abstentions. The United States objected strongly to the resolution's extreme and sweeping condemnation of Israeli practices. Additionally, the United States called for a separate vote on operative paragraph six, which characterized Israel's violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention as "war crimes and an affront to humanity." The paragraph was retained by a vote of 75 to 20 (U.S.) with 28 abstentions.

A/44/L. 20 reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories, condemned Israel's failure to acknowledge that the convention so applies, and demanded that Israel accept and comply with its provisions. The vote was 124 to 1 with 3 abstentions (U.S.). Noting it had abstained because the resolution's strident rhetoric was unhelpful, the United States called for a separate vote on operative paragraph one to reiterate our position that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the occupied territories. (The vote was 124 (U.S.) to 1 with 2 abstentions.)

A/44/L. 21 deplored measures taken by Israel designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories, citing in particular the establishment of settlements. The Committee approved this measure by a vote of 123 to 1 with 3 abstentions (U.S.). The United States said its abstention reflected its view that debate over the legalities of Israeli settlements "only diverts attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations." At the same time, the United States reaffirmed its opposition to further settlement activity in the territories.

A/44/L. 22 deplored Israel's arbitrary detention or imprisonment of Palestinians, and called on Israel "to release all Palestinians and Arabs arbitrarily detained and imprisoned as a result of their resistance against occupation in order to attain self-determination." This resolution was approved 124 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention. Noting our consistent opposition to the practice of widespread administrative detention, the United States said it voted no because the resolution went too far in its call for the release of all those detained or imprisoned as a result of activities related to resistance against the occupation—a sweeping demand that appeared to condone acts of violence and other criminal conduct.

A/44/L. 23 focused on deportation. It strongly deplored Israel's continuing disregard for relevant UN decisions concerning the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits deportations of protected persons from occupied territories. The resolution demanded that Israel rescind deportation orders previously carried out, facilitate the return of those deported and desist from future deportations. This measure was approved by a vote of 125 to 1 with 1 abstention (U.S.). The United States explained that an abstention was warranted because the resolution's harsh polemics provided no realistic means of addressing the problem of deportations. The U.S. Representative reaffirmed our position that deportation of Palestinian residents of the occupied territories is inconsistent with the Fourth Geneva Convention.

A/44/L. 24 determined that Israel's decision to extend its laws to the occupied Golan Heights was "null and void and without international legal effect" and demanded that Israel rescind the decision. The resolution also condemned Israel's persistence in "changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status" of the Golan. The vote in favor was 122 to 1 with 4 abstentions (U.S.). Despite continuing U.S. support for Security Council resolution 497 (1981) declaring that Israel's decision to impose its laws in the Golan Heights was null and void, the United States abstained on A/44/L. 24 because it contained harsh and unbalanced rhetoric. In so doing, the United States reiterated its view that the Golan problem must be resolved through negotiations in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.

Finally, draft resolution A/44/L. 25 condemned Israeli policies and practices directed against students and faculty in the territories, "especially the opening of fire on defenseless students, causing many casualties." It further condemned the "systematic Israeli campaign of repression against the closing of universities, schools and other educational institutions." The resolution was approved by a vote of 125 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention. The United States opposed this text because it viewed the resolution's sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices concerning students and educational institutions as unjustified and counterproductive.

Speaking in the Special Political Committee prior to the vote on these draft resolutions, U.S. Adviser Frank C. Urbancic, Jr., affirmed that the United States has a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintains a serious dialogue with the Israeli Government on these issues. He regretted, however, that the resolutions being considered "make no practical contribution to safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinians" in the territories, nor to "advancing the search for a just and lasting peace in the region." Urbancic called on members of the Committee to desist from unhelpful rhetoric and instead "to adopt a more constructive approach focusing on the real need for reconciliation and dialogue between the parties."

On December 8 the above seven draft resolutions were considered by the full General Assembly, which adopted them sequentially as resolutions 44/48 A through G. U.S. votes were identical with those made in the Special Political Committee, i.e., negative votes on 44/48 A, D and G; abstentions on 44/48 B, C, E and F.

UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

The Special Political Committee annually considers a series of draft resolutions related to the activities of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). UNRWA is mandated by the General Assembly to provide education, health and relief services to Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza. The United States is the largest single contributor to UNRWA; our contributions since UNRWA's inception in 1949 exceed 1 billion dollars.

During the Committee debate on the UNRWA item, 11 draft resolutions similar to those adopted in previous years were submitted by various sponsors. In voting on November 22, all 11 were approved and referred to the plenary with the recommendation that they be adopted. The United States voted in favor of four of the resolutions and voted against the other seven. A brief summary of the resolutions follows.

As in previous years, the United States sponsored the first draft resolution, A/44/L. 5, on "Assistance to Palestine Refugees." This resolution is submitted annually by the United States as a reaffirmation of our continued commitment to UNRWA. It expressed support for UNRWA programs and urged other governments to contribute generously. The resolution was approved by a vote of 130 (U.S.) to 0 with 2 abstentions.

Two draft resolutions sponsored by several Western European states, A/44/L. 9, "Working Group on Financing UNRWA," and A/44/L. 8, "Assistance to Persons Displaced as a Result of the June 1967 and Subsequent Hostilities," were approved by consensus without a vote. These texts also expressed general support for UNRWA's humanitarian efforts.

The remaining draft resolutions were sponsored by the Arab group. A/44/L. 10, "Offers by Member States of Grants and Scholarships for Higher Education, Including Vocational Training, for Palestine Refugees," appealed to governments and organizations to contribute generously to educational institutions providing instruction to Palestinian refugees. It was approved by a vote of 131 (U.S.) to 0 with 1 abstention. The United States supported this measure as a "practical approach to meeting the needs of refugees for higher education," with a reservation regarding operative paragraph five concerning a proposed Jerusalem University "Al-Quds," which the United States does not support.

A/44/L. 11, "Palestine Refugees in the Palestinian Territory Occupied by Israel since 1967," demanded that Israel "desist from the removal and resettlement of Palestine refugees" and "destruction of their shelters." The Committee voted to approve the measure 130 to 2 (U.S.). In opposing the resolution, the United States noted that it referred to Palestinian refugees' "inalienable right of return" without making reference to the negotiations among the concerned parties that are required to achieve a comprehensive settlement. The United States also indicated it was not opposed in principle to the concept of voluntary relocation of refugees who seek new and better housing.

A/44/L. 12, proposing the "Resumption of the Ration Distribution to Palestine Refugees," was approved by a vote of 108 to 20 (U.S.) with 4 abstentions. The United States voted against this proposal because "it attempts to usurp the authority of the UNRWA Commissioner General to make the decision regarding how best to administer UNRWA programs."

A/44/L. 13, the "Return of Population and Refugees Displaced Since 1967," reaffirmed the "inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return to their homes or former places of residence" in the occupied territories and strongly deplored Israel's refusal to take steps to permit such return. The vote in favor was 108 to 2 (U.S.) with 22 abstentions. The United States again objected to the reference to an "inalienable right of return" without any mention of the direct negotiations that are required to reach a settlement.

A/44/L. 14, "Revenues Derived from Palestine Refugee Properties," called for the Secretary General to establish a fund for the receipt of income, on behalf of displaced Arab owners, derived from their property and assets in Israel. The Committee approved this draft by a vote of 107 to 2 (U.S.) with 23 abstentions. The United States voted against the measure because "it seeks to prejudge the question of refugee compensation outside the context of a negotiated settlement."

A/44/L. 15 concerned the "Protection of Palestine Refugees." *Inter alia*, it urged the Secretary General, in consultation with the UNRWA Commissioner General, to "continue their efforts in support of the upholding of the safety and security and the legal and human rights" of the Palestinian refugees in the occupied territories. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 130 to 2 (U.S.). In the U.S. view, this would clearly exceed UNRWA's mandate. The United States noted the UN Legal Counsel was on record as affirming that Israel, as the occupying power, had the authority and responsibility to maintain security in the territories.

A/44/L. 16 called for the establishment of a new "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine Refugees." The vote in favor was 130 to 2 (U.S.). While affirming its strong support for practical efforts to promote higher educational opportunities for Palestinian refugees, the United States opposed this proposal because it represented an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the problem and because it was neither practical nor appropriate for the General Assembly to involve itself in such decision-making.

Finally, a new draft resolution, A/44/L. 17, called for the "Protection of Palestinian Students and Educational Institutions and Safeguarding of the Security of the Facilities of UNRWA in the Occupied Palestinian Territory." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S.) with one abstention. While affirming its deep concern over school closures and the disruption of UNRWA's activities in the West Bank and Gaza, the United States objected to the harsh condemnation of Israel in the text.

In his statement to the Committee prior to the voting on the above draft resolutions, U.S. Adviser Frank C. Urbancic, Jr., emphasized our strong support for UNRWA's humanitarian programs. He expressed regret that, as in the past, many of the resolutions submitted were highly politicized and contained sweeping and unbalanced criticism of Israel that we could not support. In the U.S. view, such resolutions "make no practical contribution to UNRWA's objectives and only serve to exacerbate tensions in an already difficult atmosphere in the occupied territories."

The General Assembly considered the 11 UNRWA-related resolutions in plenary session on December 8, adopting them sequentially as resolutions 44/47 A through K. U.S. votes were identical with those made in the Special Political Committee, i.e., yes votes on 44/47 A, B, C and D; no votes on 44/47 E, F, G, H, I, J and K.

Assistance to the Palestinian People

In the Second Committee, the non-aligned group sponsored a draft resolution that expressed alarm at the deterioration, as a result of the Israeli occupation, in the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, and requested the Secretary General to make available to the UN Conference on Trade and Development from the UN regular budget the extra funds needed to prepare the comprehensive study on the economy of the occupied territories. On November 21 the Committee voted 127 to 2 (U.S.) with 7 abstentions to approve the resolution and refer it to plenary. The full Assembly adopted the measure as resolution 44/174 on December 22 by a vote of 146 to 2 (U.S.) with 8 abstentions.

Speaking before the vote in the Second Committee, U.S. Adviser Richard Devine underscored that the United States is committed to improving the living conditions for Palestinians in the occupied territories, and since 1975 has provided more than $105 million in humanitarian and economic assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, and almost $25 million in food assistance through the PL–480 program. On budgetary grounds, the United States opposes such additional expenditures from the regular assessed UN budget. Moreover, the resolution failed to take proper note that the recent deterioration of living conditions in the occupied territories was largely attributable to economic disruption caused by the Palestinian *intifada*.

Another draft resolution in the Second Committee concerned the provision of economic assistance to the Palestinians in the occupied territories. This resolution requested the international community, the UN system and intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations to sustain and increase their assistance to the Palestinian people, "in close cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization." It also called for implementation of development projects in the occupied territory and rejected Israeli restrictions on external economic and social assistance to the Palestinian people in the occupied territory. On November 21 the Committee voted 132 to 2 (U.S.) with 2 abstentions to approve the resolution and refer it to plenary. The full Assembly adopted the measure as resolution 44/235 on December 22 by a vote of 146 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention.

Speaking in the Second Committee before the vote, the U.S. Representative emphasized that the United States supports providing economic assistance to the Palestinians, as it does through UNRWA and various private voluntary organizations. However, reference to the "national economy" of the Palestinian people appears to presuppose a Palestinian state, a prejudgment of negotiations to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict. Moreover, the United States has consistently opposed using the PLO as a conduit for providing international assistance to the Palestinian people.

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States

On behalf of Arab League cosponsors, Libya introduced in plenary on October 17 the traditional resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States. As in the past several years, the United States voted against the text, which was adopted as resolution 44/7 by a vote of 143 to 2 (U.S.). In a statement before the vote, U.S. Representative Pearl Bailey explained that the United States was not opposed to the general principle of enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and the Arab League. She said the United States could not support the resolution, however, because its operative paragraph three requested that the Secretary General attempt to implement previous General Assembly resolutions that the United States had opposed as damaging to the prospects for peace and security in the Middle East.

Observer Status For the Council of Europe

On October 13 the General Assembly plenary adopted without a vote resolution 44/6, admitting the Council of Europe to observer status in the United Nations. The matter did not go through a committee.

Conflict Between Iran and Iraq

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1989 the Secretary General and his special respresentative for Iran and Iraq, Jan Eliasson, Sweden's Permanent Respresentative to the United Nations, continued their efforts to resume direct talks between Iran and Iraq in Geneva on implementing the Security Council resolution 598 (1987), which set forth a plan for peace between the two sides as well as for implementation of the cease-fire they accepted.

In late January Iraq unilaterally repatriated 255 Iranian prisoners of war. In February Iran responded by repatriating 260 sick and wounded Iraqi prisoners of war.

In February the Secretary General met with Iranian Foreign Minister Velyati and Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz to lay the groundwork for bilateral peace negotiations. Additional technical talks were conducted in early March by Ambassador Eliasson. However, the ministerial-level talks scheduled for late March to prepare for peace negotiations in early April were postponed until late April in Geneva, and then were recessed indefinitely when it became clear that the two sides were deadlocked once more over several key preliminary issues.

In late May Iran unilaterally repatriated 49 Iraqi prisoners of war through the intermediary of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

In July the Secretary General held separate meetings with Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati in Geneva and with Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz in Rome with the view to resuming direct talks. He met with them again separately in August during the summit meeting of member countries of the non-aligned movement at Belgrade, and during the General Assembly in September in an effort to restart direct talks.

On September 22 the Secretary General issued a report on the activities of the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) whose mission is to oversee the cease-fire between the two countries. Paragraph 41 of that report outlined the Secretary General's efforts to implement resolution 598 as an integrated whole, an approach which the Council has repeatedly supported, and underlined the urgency which the Council attached to particular provisions of the resolution. The Secretary General emphasized that the resolution demands a withdrawal to the internationally recognized boundaries without delay. There is, however, also a concurrent need to assure each side of the other's firm commitment to the full implementation of the resolution, even though all the elements do not require the same amount of time to be implemented. He said that such assurances, which would be in conformity wilth relevant principles of international law, should be given in a manner that would lay the foundation for stability and peace in the region. In this context, he emphasized that the full resumption of the economic life of the two countries would be to the advantage of both.

The Security Council met twice during the year to renew the 6-month mandate of the UN Iran–Iraq Military Observer Group. On February 8 the Council unanimously adopted resolution 642, extending UNIIMOG's mandate through September 30. The Council voted unanimously again on September 29 to renew the mandate until March 31, 1990. (Resolution 642.) The latter resolution called once again on the parties to implement immediately Security Council resolution 598 (1987).

U.S. Ambassador Pickering issued a statement on the renewal of the UNIIMOG mandate expressing support for UNIIMOG, the Secretary General and his special representative in their efforts to achieve comprehensive implementation of resolution 598, which provides the framework for a just and durable settlement of the conflict. He noted with deep regret that more than 2 years after the adoption of resolution 598 and more than 1 year after the cease-fire went into effect, this mandatory resolution of the Security Council remains unimplemented, and urged that both sides cooperate fully with the Secretary General in resuming the negotiations in a spirit of goodwill. Ambassador Pickering added the particular concern of his government over the plight of some 100,000 Iranian and Iraqi prisoners of war who remain in captivity, despite the appeals and efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross. He said:

> We call on both sides to fulfill their obligation under the Geneva Conventions by cooperating fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross to facilitate the visitation, registration and repatriation of all prisoners of war.

Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati held a press conference at the United Nations on September 29 in which he blamed Iraq for resisting the unconditional implementation of resolution 598, and said he wanted the Security Council to support the Secretary General's proposal for the repatriation of prisoners of war and withdrawal of forces to the international border. Meanwhile, Iraqi President Sadam Hussein pressed his proposal for joint committees between the two sides to discuss technical issues in preparation for direct peace negotiations.

The Secretary General announced that his special representative, Jan Eliasson, would undertake a diplomatic mission to Iran and Iraq the end of October with the view to exploring with the two sides how to overcome obstacles to the resumption of direct talks. On October 27 the Security Council President issued a statement on behalf of the Council members, which noted that over 2 years had elapsed since resolution 598 had been adopted and that over 14 months had gone by since the cease-fire had taken effect. They expressed profound concern that tangible progress had not been made since then in achieving full implementation of resolution 598. They further expressed the hope that both sides would work constructively and in a spirit of good will with the Secretary General's personal representative in order that early and substantial progress can be achieved in the implementation of Security Council resolution 598, and reiterated their full and unanimous support for the Secretary General and his personal representative.

Ambassador Eliasson made three visits each to Baghdad and Tehran during November for discussions on beginning the peace negotiations. Upon his return at the end of the month, the Secretary General reported to the Security Council on the progress made during the mission of his special representative, especially that the foreign ministers of Iran and Iraq had agreed to meet separately with the Secretary General in New York in mid-December. The Council President issued the following statement after hearing the Secretary General's report of the Eliasson mission.

> The UN Security Council had heard the report of the Secretary General on the question of Iran and Iraq. The Council members were unanimous in their support for his efforts, in the belief that with the support and cooperation of Iran and Iraq with him, resolution 598 will be implemented at an early date as an integrated whole.

In mid-December the Secretary General met separately with Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati and Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz to urge both sides to accept his suggestions for implementation of resolution 598. Both sides agreed in principle to direct talks at the ministerial level. However, the key problems regarding modalities and conditions continued to pose a major obstacle to beginning direct peace negotiations.

At year's end, the cease-fire was holding with only minor violations reported. Iraqi forces continued to occupy Iranian territory, and an estimated 100,000 POW's (70,000 Iraqis and 30,000 Iranians) remained in captivity.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly carried over from previous years an agenda item on the "Consequences of the Prolongation of the Armed Conflict Between Iran and Iraq." A resolution was adopted under this item in its first year of introduction (1982) by the 37th General Assembly, but no action has been taken in subsequent years. The 44th General Assembly again decided not to take action, retaining the item on the agenda for the next session.

Afghanistan

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and the precedent of a consensus resolution in the 43rd General Assembly on the Afghan situation led to the adoption of a second consensus resolution (44/15) in the 44th

General Assembly. By general agreement, the resolution, entitled "The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security," was introduced by the President of the General Assembly and was adopted without debate. The resolution reiterates a provision from the previous year which "requests the Secretary General to encourage and facilitate the early realization of a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva agreements and of the present resolution." The General Assembly provided a contingency fund of $5.8 million to permit the Secretary General and his special representative to carry out this mission.

The UN Good Offices Mission for Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) continued its mission throughout 1989. On February 15 UNGOMAP reported to the Secretary General that the withdrawal of foreign (i.e., Soviet) troops from Afghanistan had been completed in compliance with the fourth instrument of the Geneva Accords. With its major task completed, UNGOMAP forces in 1989 numbered approximately 40 officers, down from its previous high of 51.

UNGOMAP costs were funded from the regular UN budget. The 43rd General Assembly approved gross expenditures of $13,402,500 for UNGOMAP in the 1988–1989 UN program budget. The expenditure level was offset, in part, by a $5 million voluntary contribution from Japan which, in net terms, reduced the 1988–1989 approved UNGOMAP expenditures to $8,402,500.

Cambodia

CREDENTIALS AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations began dealing with the Cambodia issue in the wake of Vietnam's invasion of that country in 1978. This year, for the seventh consecutive time, Hanoi chose not to challenge the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea (now represented by the coalition government of the Cambodian resistance) in the UN General Assembly. In earlier General Assemblies, Vietnam's challenge to the Democratic Kampuchea seat was overwhelmingly defeated in plenary. The report of the Credentials Committee, which accepted Democratic Kampuchea's credentials, among others, was adopted in the General Assembly by consensus on October 17. (Resolution 44/5 A.)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Since the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in December 1978, the General Assembly has passed resolutions by overwhelming and increasing majorities calling for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodia, self-determination for the Cambodian people and aid to Khmer refugees. Although reiterating the central self-determination and aid themes, this year's resolution (44/22) introduced in the 44th General Assembly modified the references to foreign forces by noting the announced withdrawal of foreign (i.e., Vietnamese) forces from Kampuchea. However, the resolution emphasized that the withdrawal had not been verified by the United Nations and was not conducted within the framework of a comprehensive political settlement. It also deplored foreign armed intervention and occupation as the cause for continuing hostilities in Cambodia.

The resolution was introduced, as it has been every year, by the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), comprised of Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The resolution, which had a record 79 cosponsors, was adopted on November 16 by a vote of 124 (U.S.) to 17, with 12 abstentions. This represents two more affirmative votes than the 122 received for ASEAN's 1988 resolution. (Resolution 43/19).

The resolution reiterated the conviction of the General Assembly

> . . . that the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea under supervision and control of the United Nations; the creation of an interim administering authority; the promotion of national reconciliation among all Kampucheans under the leadership of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk; the non-return to the universally condemned policies and practices of a recent past; the restoration and preservation of the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and neutral and non-aligned status of Kampuchea; the reaffirmation of the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny and the commitment by all states to non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, with effective guarantees, are the principle components of any just, lasting and comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem.

Speaking for the United States on November 15, Ambassador Alexander F. Watson stated that

> . . . the United States strongly supports the draft resolution now before us. The objective of the resolution is neither to punish Vietnam for its crimes against Cambodia, nor to reward Vietnam for its announced withdrawal of troops. What this resolution seeks is to secure for the Cambodian people the right enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations—the right of self-determination.
>
> The resolution emphasizes two major preconditions for peace in Cambodia: the need for a comprehensive solution and a commitment against the return to power of the Khmer Rouge, to which the United States and the international community are unalterably opposed. A comprehensive solution must allow the Cambodian people themselves to at last determine their future course. Having suffered unspeakable atrocities at the hands of Pol Pot, we cannot imagine that the Cambodian people would ever willingly allow the Khmer Rouge to exercise control over that country's destiny but, we are confident, will reject them decisively at the ballot box.

South African Policies of Apartheid

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

At the 43rd UN General Assembly in 1988, it was agreed that the General Assembly would hold a special session on "Apartheid and its Destructive

Consequences in Southern Africa" in 1989. The United States joined consensus on this resolution, on the understanding that it would take place in conjunction with the regular 44th General Assembly and that the Assembly would not hold further discussions on the issue during its regular session. In fact, the Assembly considered South African questions on two occasions before the special session, which was held December 12–14.

On September 27 a group primarily of African countries introduced a resolution calling on the Government of South Africa to commute the death sentence of a man who had been convicted of a murder in 1985. Two others convicted at the same time were sentenced only to jail because of extenuating circumstances, but Mangena Jeffrey Boesman was sentenced to death by hanging. After carefully evaluating the case, the United States determined that it could not support the resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 149 to none, with 2 abstentions (U.S., U.K.). (Resolution 44/1.)

After the vote, Ambassador Pickering noted the clear U.S. position on political prisoners in South Africa, as well as repeated U.S. calls for an end to violence from all sources. He added,

> . . . there can be no circumstances in which a violent murder such as the one in this case—what has come to be called a "necklacing"—could be considered a rightful political act. Mr. Boesman was convicted of burning to death a woman in her fifties, apparently because she took her children to school at the time of a strike against school attendance. We have nothing to suggest that Mr. Boesman did not receive a fair trial, or that he was not guilty of the offense for which he was tried. . . . We have abstained in the voting because we do not believe we should oppose a call for a commutation of sentence under the special and particuarly difficult circumstances which prevail in South Africa today.

The General Assembly considered the question of "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" at eight meetings between November 7 and 22, with voting on 12 resolutions taking place the last day of debate. While several of the resolutions were new, nine of them were virtually identical with those considered by the General Assembly in previous years. As is customary, the Assembly dealt with the issue in plenary session without prior reference to a main committee. (Resolutions 44/27 A to L.)

During the debate, over 80 speakers took part, not counting rights of reply and explanations of vote. Although there was virtually unanimous mention of recent positive steps taken by the Government of South Africa to reduce tensions, the majority of speakers dismissed them as insufficient, or even as efforts to maintain the apartheid system. As in the past, nearly all speakers supported imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, and some warned members of the Security Council that failure to impose such measures would increase the likelihood of violence in South Africa over the long term. Notable this year was the adoption for the first time, by consensus, of a resolution on "international support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations." Also adopted by consensus was the annual resolution on the UN Trust Fund for South Africa.

In explanation of the U.S. position after voting was completed, Ambassador Jonathan Moore said it was a source of sadness that the Assembly must meet again, as so often in the past, to consider resolutions concerning apartheid. "The U.S. Government and people have repeatedly made clear our abhorrence of apartheid . . . . It must be dismantled and replaced, and we will continue to work for that objective through peaceful negotiations, to achieve a nonracial, democratic system of government." On the resolution endorsing genuine negotiations, he noted the U.S. Government had "made explicit numerous times its belief that the only way truly to resolve the difficult issues in South Africa is through peaceful negotiations." He noted actions taken by authorities in South Africa as well as the widening recognition of the need for peaceful negotiations. "These are first steps; there still is a long and difficult road ahead."

Unfortunately, Ambassador Moore continued, not all of the resolutions before the Assembly demonstrated as much wisdom. Several of them endorsed armed struggle, to which the United States repeatedly emphasizes its objection, especially in the forum of the United Nations, for that was "wholly contrary to the dedicated search for peaceful solutions to the world's problems which is the *raison d'etre* of this Assembly, our purpose in meeting here." Likewise, the United States remained opposed to comprehensive, mandatory sanctions, although it has imposed and enforced the most stringent sanctions against South Africa of any member of this Assembly to encourage the South African Government to move through peaceful negotiations towards the elimination of apartheid. "Now is not the time to rebuff these signs of progress by the introduction of additional sanctions by the international community," he added. He also noted with regret the persistence of name-calling in some resolutions. "We cannot support resolutions which single out by name any country to condemn for actions which we all know are taken by others, including some of the most vocal in their criticism."

In conclusion, Ambassador Moore said,

> . . . for the first time in years, it is possible to be somewhat hopeful that a negotiation scenario may be just on the horizon. The great pressures . . . to accept change are growing and are helping convince the South African Government that it must move beyond its current position and accept fundamental change. It is now increasingly clear to that government that the well-being of the white minority cannot be sustained without a negotiated political settlement that results in political equality for all South Africans.

The first resolution, entitled "International Solidarity with the Liberation Struggle in South Africa," was introduced by Nigeria and had 68 other sponsors. As in the past, this resolution reaffirmed the legitimacy of the armed struggle and demanded an end to the state of emergency in South Africa and the unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees. States were called upon to increase all forms of necessary assistance to the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements. The resolution also continued the authorization of funds from the UN's regular budget for the maintenance of offices in New York by the two principal South African insurgent movements (ANC and PAC). The United States voted against this resolution because of its reaffirmation of the legitimacy of armed struggle. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 129 to 4 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "International Support for the Eradication of Apartheid in South Africa through Genuine Negotiations," was introduced by Nigeria and supported by 84 cosponsors. After considerable negotiation, the text of the resolution was modified to enable all countries to join in consensus support. In explaining U.S. support for the text, Ambassador Moore noted the U.S. Government had "made explicit numerous times its belief that the only way truly to resolve the difficult issues in South Africa is through peaceful negotiations." The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 44/27 B.)

The third resolution, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the Racist Regime of South Africa," was almost exactly the same as the resolution of the same name from the previous year. It reaffirmed that apartheid is both "a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security," decided that "the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most appropriate, effective and peaceful means to bring apartheid to an end," and urgently requested the Security Council to implement such sanctions, as well as to strengthen the mandatory arms embargo imposed against South Africa in 1977.

This resolution also contained an explicit reference to the Federal Republic of Germany, calling it "the leading trading partner of South Africa." The Federal Republic of Germany Delegation objected to that language and sought to have it removed through a separate vote. The Assembly decided to retain the language by a vote of 53 to 40 (U.S., Federal Republic of Germany), with 41 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution as a whole because of U.S. opposition to comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 118 to 11 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 C.)

The fourth resolution, entitled "Imposition, Coordination and Strict Monitoring of Measures against Racist South Africa," was introduced and cosponsored by members of the African Group and the non-aligned caucus. As in the previous year, this resolution urged "all states that have not yet done so, pending imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, to adopt legislative and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions against South Africa." It again specified embargoes on the supply of products that could be used by the South African military or nuclear industry and a ban on the importation of coal, gold, strategic minerals and agricultural products from South Africa and a number of other economic measures. Because of this resolution's advocacy of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, the United States again voted against it. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 135 to 3 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 D.)

The fifth resolution, entitled "International Financial Pressure on the Apartheid Economy of South Africa," was introduced by Nigeria with 63 cosponsors. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 140 to 4 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 E.)

The sixth resolution, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel," was introduced this year by Kuwait and numerous cosponsors. It "condemned the collaboration of Israel with the racist minority regime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 114 to 22 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 F.)

The seventh resolution, on the "Program of Work of the Special Committee Against Apartheid," was introduced by Nepal and cosponsored by 65 other countries. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 145 to none, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 44/27 G.)

The eighth resolution, entitled "Oil Embargo against South Africa," *inter alia,* urged the Security Council to impose a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa and requested the states to adopt effective measures to broaden the scope of the embargo. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 139 to 2 (U.S., U.K.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 H.)

The ninth resolution entitled "Military Collaboration with South Africa," was introduced by Zambia with 25 cosponsors. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 106 to 17 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 I.)

The tenth resolution concerned the "UN Trust Fund for South Africa," and as in previous years expressed appreciation to governments, organizations and individuals that contributed to the fund. It appealed for direct contributions to the voluntary agencies that rendered assistance to victims of apartheid. The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 44/27 J.)

The eleventh resolution called for "Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid," and was introduced by Denmark and cosponsored by 23 other countries. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 151 to 2 (U.S., UK), with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 K.)

The twelfth and final resolution was entitled "Support of the Work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports," and was introduced by Ghana and supported by 21 cosponsors. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 127 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. (Resolution 44/27 L.)

Special Session of the General Assembly on Apartheid

As agreed at the 43rd General Assembly, a special session on "Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa" was held in New York December 12–14, just before the close of the regular Assembly session. Under General Assembly President Garba of Nigeria, the special session heard over 90 speakers during 3 days of debate, including President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe and President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, Chairman of the Front-Line States. The special session was also addressed by representatives of the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), the two principal anti-apartheid movements from South Africa, who have observer status at the General Assembly.

Well before the session began, its sponsors made clear their desire that it result in a single resolution or declaration, adopted by consensus, setting forth the unanimous views of the General Assembly on apartheid and its consequences in South Africa and what steps could be taken to remedy the situation. Starting from the so-called Harare Declaration proposed by the ANC and adopted by the OAU in the Zimbabwean capital on August 21, 1989, negotiations on a proposed text began even before the regular General Assembly session. U.S. Representatives, including Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Herman J. Cohen, held numerous meetings with key players, from the UN Center against Apartheid to the ANC, throughout this period and during the special session.

During the special session itself, drafting of the text was assigned to the Committee of the Whole (COW) under the chairmanship of Dame Anne Hercus, Ambassador of New Zealand, who appointed a smaller group to negotiate specific language changes. Known as the Friends of the Chair, this group included, among others, representatives of Front-Line States Zambia and Zimbabwe, the ANC, the United Kingdom] and the United States. The real work of drafting the final declaration was carried out by this group, which worked through the night on two occasions to complete the final draft. This draft was then presented to the plenary session by the Chair of the Committee of the Whole and adopted, unanimously, on the final day of the special session.

The declaration of the special session was widely greeted as a significant achievement. In it, the members of the United Nations reaffirmed their conviction that "where colonial and racial domination of apartheid exist, there can be neither peace nor justice;" reaffirmed "the right of all peoples including the people of South Africa, to determine their own destiny and to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live and work together to build a harmonious society;" and noted they had "repeatedly expressed our objective of a solution arrived at by peaceful means" and that "the people of South Africa, and their liberation movements who have felt compelled to take up arms, have also upheld their preference for this position . . . ." To this end, the declaration set out fundamental principles, elements for a climate conducive to negotiations and guidelines for the negotiation process.

Acceptance of certain fundamental principles "could constitute the basis for an internationally acceptable solution that will enable South Africa to take its rightful place . . . among the world community of nations." Among those principles, South Africa should "become a united, nonracial and democratic state," with "common and equal citizenship and nationality . . . [and] the right to participate in the government and administration of the country on the basis of universal, equal suffrage, under a nonracial voters' roll, and by secret ballot, in a united and nonfragmented South Africa." All South Africans should have the right to form and join any political party of their choice . . . [and] to enjoy universally recognized human rights, freedoms and civil liberties . . . ." The country shall have a legal system that will guarantee equality before the law, with an independent and nonracial judiciary, and an economic order should be created that would "promote and advance the well-being of all South Africans . . . ."

To create a climate for negotiations, the South African authorities should (1) release all political prisoners and detainees, (2) lift all bans and restrictions on organizations and persons, (3) remove all troops from the townships, (4) end the state of emergency and repeal all legislation designed to circumscribe political activity and (5) cease all political trials and executions. Three guidelines for negotiations were set out: (1) agreement on the mechanism for drawing up a new constitution based on the above principles (2) agreement on the role to be played by the international community in ensuring a successful transition to a democratic order and (3) agreed transitional arrangements and modalities for the process of crafting and adopting the new constitution and the transition, including the holding of elections. Finally, the Secretary General was requested to transmit copies of the declaration to the South African Government and by July 1, 1990, to prepare a report on progress made in implementing the declaration.

The U.S. explanation of position was made by Ambassador Jonathan Moore. The United States believed a new era of conciliation, negotiation and change may be emerging in South Africa, where President de Klerk had met the previous day with ANC leader Nelson Mandela. The United States was pleased to join consensus on the declaration, because it met the concern "that the United Nations be unanimous in sending an unambiguous signal to the people of South Africa in support of the negotiating process which we believe may be emerging in that country." Ambassador Moore added several points, to make clear the U.S. position on the negotiations. The United States called upon all sides to renounce violence. It believed very strongly that "it is the responsibility of the people of South Africa, alone, to decide what is right for them." Any attempt to prescribe steps to be taken represented interference, but the declaration did make some suggestions and give some advice. Finally, the United States was pleased to note that the declaration omitted "elements which some had earlier proposed, such as additional mandatory sanctions, an international framework for those negotiations or for the transition process, or the establishment of an interim government." Such ideas were felt to be wholly inappropriate for such a document.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution S–16/1.)

Other African Questions

COMORIAN ISLAND OF MAYOTTE

The question of the Comorian Island of Mayotte has been included in the General Assembly's agenda since 1976. The dispute between France and the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros hinges on the status of the Island of Mayotte, where referenda in both 1974 and 1976 indicated a preference by the largely Christian population to remain part of France rather than join in association with the other, predominantly Muslim, Comoros Islands, which have been independent since 1975.

In the 44th General Assembly, the Mayotte Question was considered in plenary on October 18. Following speeches by a small number of delegations, including France and the Comoros, the Assembly voted on a draft resolution that was again identical to the one approved the previous year. The resolution reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over Mayotte, called for the "translation into practice" of the wish for a just solution expressed by the President of France, and urged France to accelerate the process of negotiations with a view to ensuring the return of Mayotte to the Comoros. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 128 to 1, with 4 abstentions (U.S.) (Resolution 44/9.)

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

Like other regional groupings, the African Group annually introduces a draft resolution in the General Assembly that calls for cooperation between the United Nations and a regional body, in this case the Organization of African Unity (OAU). These resolutions are usually adopted without debate and by consensus. However, during the 43rd General Assembly the draft resolution included new language which called upon the Secretary General to become involved in the search for solutions to Africa's debt and debt-servicing burden. The United States could not support this language and called for a vote, casting the sole vote against the resolution.

The draft resolution which was submitted during the 44th General Assembly adequately modified the unacceptable language, and the United

States was again able to join consensus on the resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 44/17.)

Hostage Taking

In connection with the plight of the hostages held in Lebanon, the Council took up the question of terrorism and hostage-taking. On July 31, after several days of negotiations, the Council adopted resolution 636 condemning all acts of hostage-taking and abduction, and calling upon all states to use their political influence to secure the safe release of all hostages and abducted persons and to prevent the commission of such acts. The President of the Council made a statement before the resolution was adopted noting the reports that U.S. Lt. Col. William Higgins was reported to have been killed, having been taken hostage in southern Lebanon while he was on assignment for UNTSO, which underlined the necessity for effective international action on hostage-taking and abduction to deter such unlawful, criminal and cruel acts in the future.

Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question

The United Kingdom has occupied the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) since 1833. The islands lie 250 miles off the southeastern tip of Argentina, which maintains that it inherited a Spanish claim to them. The 1982 Falklands War, initiated by Argentina, exacerbated the dispute. The United States takes no position concerning the rival claims to sovereignty and has urged that both sides resolve their differences through diplomatic means.

On November 1, following consultations and noting the circulation as UN documents of two joint statements by the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom reflecting progress in their talks, the President of the General Assembly proposed, and the Assembly decided, to postpone consideration of the item until the 45th session.

Panama

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

During 1989 the Security Council met twice to hear Panamanian complaints regarding the United States and once to consider a Cuban-Nicaraguan draft resolution condemning U.S. action in Panama. The resolution was defeated.

At Panama's request, the Security Council met April 28 to hear complaints of U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Panama, reneging on Panama Canal treaty commitments and spreading "chaos and destabilization" as a pretext for a U.S. military invasion. The United States responded that Panama's crisis was a result of military dictatorship and that the solution to Panama's lack of democracy was in Panama, not in the Security Council.

Subsequent to the annulment by Noriega of the May 7 internationally observed elections, in which the Noriega regime was defeated by a 3 to 1 margin, and following intense effort by the Organization of the American States to persuade the Noriega regime to leave power September 1, the date for transfer of power set by the Panamanian constitution, Panama called for a Security Council meeting. At the August 11 meeting, Panama's Foreign Minister Ritter alleged the United States was violating the Carter–Torrijos Canal Treaties and was fabricating a pretext for a U.S. military invasion. He called for military observers and for the Security Council to become the "custodian" of the Panama Canal treaties.

Ambassador Okun, speaking on behalf of the United States, noted that the Panama statement, full of fabrications and falsehoods, was an attempt to divert attention from the Organization of American States' consideration of Panama and from the Noriega regime's election defeat. He stated that the United States fully respected its obligations under the treaties and "would not tolerate interference in fulfillment of treaty obligations from any quarter."

At both the April and the August meetings, only Panama and the United States spoke. The Security Council took no action.

The United States notified the President of the Security Council of U.S. military action shortly after the early-morning commencement of "Operation Just Cause" December 20. This notification was made in accordance with the Article 51 UN Charter provision that self-defensive measures be reported immediately to the Security Council.

The Security Council met in formal session that same day. The Soviet and Chinese statements condemned U.S. intervention and the use of force as contrary to the UN Charter. Nicaragua characterized U.S. action not only as a violation of Panamanian sovereignty but also as a threat to all of Central America. The French, Canadians and the United Kingdom spoke in favor of U.S. action.

On December 21, after lengthy consultations, the Security Council voted 14 to 0 with one abstention (U.S.) to invite the Government of Panama to participate in the Security Council debate on the situation in Panama. Ambassador Pickering, in his explanation of the U.S. abstention, noted that first it was necessary to decide who would represent Panama. Both the Noriega-designated Permanent Representative de Bellavista and the Endara-designate Vallarino had presented credentials. The immediate issue was resolved when, at the request of the Security Council President (Colombia), both Panamanian claimants withdrew their requests to speak.

On December 23 the United States, France and the United Kingdom vetoed a Security Council resolution deploring U.S. intervention in Panama proposed by Nicaragua and cosponsored by Algeria, Colombia, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia. Canada voted against the resolution; Finland abstained. The U.S. statement stressed that action in Panama was taken in self-defense, in response to Noriega's declaration that he was in a "state of war" with the United States and the subsequent attacks on Americans; and that U.S. goals in Panama were to protect American lives, preserve the Canal treaties, reestablish democracy and combat narcotics trafficking.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Nicaragua was unsuccessful in achieving Assembly-wide condemnation of U.S. action in Panama. On December 29, by a vote of less than half the membership, the General Assembly adopted a revised Cuban/Nicaraguan resolution (A/44/L.63) "strongly deploring" U.S. intervention. Twenty-three states did not participate in the final 75 to 20 (U.S.) vote with 40 abstentions, a significant break in the traditionally solid non-aligned movement block.

Situation in Central America

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1989 the Security Council met in formal session four times to consider questions related to Central America. The United States voted in favor of resolution 637, adopted unanimously, supporting the Secretary General's initiatives in Central America and resolution 644, also unanimous, establishing a security monitoring group. Following November escalations of violence in Central America, El Salvador requested a Security Council meeting, held November 30. At a followup meeting on December 8, the Security Council President issued a statement, reflecting the sense of the Council, in support of the Esquipulas process.

Though not necessarily reflected in the number of formal meetings, UN and Security Council involvement in Central America increased dramatically in 1989. At the three summit meetings held during the year (Tesoro, Tela and San Isidro), the Central American Presidents sought to revive the Esquipulas II peace process, formally inviting the United Nations to monitor elections, security and voluntary demobilization. In keeping with commitments to Esquipulas II and strong interests in ensuring full compliance with that agreement, the United States supported Security Council action to encourage the presidents' initiatives for UN monitoring groups in Central America.

Esquipulas II and Related Accords

Underlying this year's surge in activity was the Esquipulas (Guatemala) II Accord of August 7, 1987, signed by the five Central American presidents (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua). This agreement, Costa Rica President Arias' Nobel Peace prize-winning document, provided a framework for establishing a stable and lasting peace in Central

America based on the democratization of the region. The document's 11 topics are: national reconciliation based on dialogue, amnesty and a Committee of National Reconciliation; cessation of hostilities; democratization; free elections; cessation of aid to irregular forces and insurgent movements; non-use of territory to attack other states; weapons limitation negotiations; refugee assistance; accelerated development; international verification and followup; and timetables.

On March 24, 1989, as the new Bush administration was forming, the U.S. Congress expressed support for Esquipulas II through its Bi-Partisan Accord on Central America. This document called for "credible standards of compliance, strict timetables for enforcement, and effective, ongoing means to verify both the democratic and security requirements of those agreements."

As the year proceeded, the United Nations gradually forged consensus on election (ONUVEN), voluntary demobilization (CIAV), and security (ONUCA) compliance monitoring groups, the first two in cooperation with the Organization of American States.

UN Mission for the Verification of the Elections in Nicaragua

The UN Mission for the Verification of the Elections in Nicaragua (ONUVEN) was established following the Joint Declaration of February 14 at Tesoro Beach (Costa del Sol, El Salvador), in which the five Central American presidents requested that international election observers, "specifically the United Nations and the Organization of American States" monitor the elections that Nicaraguan President Ortega, as a result of that Tesoro meeting, had agreed to hold elections by February 25, 1990. A March 3, 1989, letter from the Government of Nicaragua confirmed the request.

Following a UN reconnaissance mission, the Secretary General and the Government of Nicaragua agreed on July 6 to UN terms of participation in election monitoring, specifying that observers have diplomatic privileges and immunities; unrestricted freedom of movement and full access to political parties and polling places.

The mandate of the mission was to verify the election process at every stage and in all electoral districts. The mission would monitor the balance and responsiveness of electoral councils, equality of political organizing opportunities and media access for all parties and proper voter registration. The Secretary General stressed that the decision to send an observer mission should not be construed as a value judgment of Nicaragua's electoral laws.

The Secretary General based his decision to monitor the elections on the General Assembly's consensus resolution 43/24, "Procedure for the Establishment of a Firm and Lasting Peace in Central America," which, *inter alia,* requested the Secretary General to afford the fullest possible support to the Central American governments in their efforts to achieve peace. The Secretary General informed the Security Council and the General Assembly July 6 of his decision to launch ONUVEN July 14. In resolution 637 and in a letter dated September 20 to the Secretary General regarding UN monitoring functions in general, the United States joined other Security Council members in specifically endorsing the Secretary General's ONUVEN decision.

ONUVEN officially opened offices in Managua August 25. The Secretary General appointed Elliot Richardson, a prominent American lawyer, as his personal representative for the verification of the Nicaraguan elections. During 1989 ONUVEN issued the first two of five reports on the election process. These reports covered political party/election organization and voter registration.

International Commission for Support and Verification

The International Commission for Support and Verification (CIAV) grew out of the August 4-7 summit at Tela, Honduras, at which the Central American presidents issued a declaration endorsing

> . . . a joint plan for the voluntary demobilization, repatriation or relocation in Nicaragua or third countries of the Nicaraguan Resistance and their families and for assistance in the demobilization of all those involved in armed actions in the countries of the region when such persons voluntarily request it.

To implement the plan, the Tela document called for the creation of CIAV, to be formed by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, "who may act through their representatives." CIAV was to be formed within 30 days of Tela and to complete its task 90 days later.

In the Tela agreement, the Central Americans anticipated the following tasks for CIAV: maintain direct contacts with the Nicaraguan Resistance in order to promote its return to Nicaragua and its integration in the political process; assume responsibility for all activities that make possible the voluntary demobilization—repatriation—relocation, including the reception and installation of repatriated persons at their destinations; determine procedures to receive arms equipment and military supplies from members of the Nicaraguan Resistance; verify camp dismantlement; control and supervise temporary residence in Nicaragua if necessary; organize reception centers and follow through on security guarantees. According to a separate chapter of the agreement, CIAV was to offer similar assistance to Salvadoran Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) members who agreed to demobilize voluntarily.

On August 14 the Central American permanent representatives officially requested the establishment of CIAV. On August 28 the Secretary General notified the Security Council of his intention, with the Organization of

American States, to participate in CIAV, beginning September 6. He noted that collecting weapons was a military function and he would return to the Security Council for approval of any military function.

The United Nations publicly announced its participation in CIAV September 1, noting the Secretary General had named UN Assistant Secretary General de Soto as coordinator. In a joint UN-OAS press conference September 12, December 8 was announced as the date for the completion of the voluntary demobilization—repatriation—relocation process, along with their observation that that deadline was unlikely to be met.

Also on September 1, U.S. Ambassador Pickering issued the following statement for the press:

> The United States is staying in close touch with the Secretary General on his emerging role in Central America. We support his role in dealing in an integrated way with all three aspects of the peace plan: democratization; cessation of interference across international borders in other countries' affairs; and voluntary demobilization of all insurgent forces. We believe the UN role should be closely tied to the OAS role and are pleased that it is off to a good start.

In a letter of support to the Secretary General dated September 20, initially drafted by the United States and revised in conjunction with the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Coordinator, the Security Council noted approval of the Secretary General's decision regarding CIAV and expressed full support for the Secretary General's mission of good offices in consultation with the Security Council "to facilitate the implementation of the wishes of the Central American governments as expressed in Esquipulas and related documents."

Initially, Nicaragua objected to any text at all. The final version, drafted by Security Council President Nogueria-Batista of Brazil, with the assistance of Guatemala Permanent Representative Villagran, incorporated U.S. concerns that CIAV have firm Security Council grounding, that it provide clear reference to Esquipulas II documents and the whole of the peace process, and that it request the Secretary General to consult with the Security Council and keep it fully and regularly informed of action taken in support of the Central American peace process.

The United States insisted that democratic and security conditions in Nicaragua be adequate for the safe return of refugees and the Nicaraguan Resistance prior to Resistance voluntary demobilization. Conditions were to include assurances of physical well-being, and provisions for full enjoyment of political, economic, civil and human rights.

Throughout the fall, in addition to communicating with insurgents and assessing their needs, CIAV attempted to negotiate cease-fires and to establish dialogue between the FMLN and the Government of El Salvador and between the Nicaraguan Resistance and the Government of Nicaragua.

UN Observer Group in Central America

Though mentioned in Esquipulas, requested first by the Central American presidents in November 1988, and requested again at Tesoro and Tela, the UN Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA), the security monitoring force, was the last of the three monitoring groups to be launched in 1989. This was due in part to El Salvador President Duarte's failing health and the impending Christiani inauguration, plus some unresolved differences between Nicaragua and Honduras over a dispute before the International Court of Justice that put ONUCA and several other aspects of the Esquipulas process on hold until the Tela meeting.

At that August meeting the Central American presidents again requested a security monitoring force, this time hoping it would assist CIAV in receiving weapons. This task would later prove impractical, since the Security Council would need full control of an armed peacekeeping group, whereas CIAV was a joint effort of the United Nations and the Organization of American States. The dilemma was resolved by the UN Secretary General's determining that, should a need to collect weapons materialize, an armed unit of ONUCA would be established through the authority of the Security Council.

Following a UN reconnaissance mission to the region, the Secretary General presented a plan for an unarmed military observer group to the Security Council.

In weighing costs and objectives, the United States sought to ensure ONUCA effectiveness in halting arms supplies to the FMLN. The United States stressed that the ONUCA mandate, coupled with the election monitoring terms of reference and the voluntary demobilization—repatriation—relocation proposal, must exert maximum pressure on Nicaragua to democratize and to create conditions that would permit the safe and voluntary return of the Nicaraguan Resistance and their families with guarantees of the political and human rights and personal security.

On November 7 the Security Council voted unanimously in favor of adopting resolution 644 to deploy an unarmed security force for the purpose of monitoring two aspects of Esquipulas: the cessation of aid (except humanitarian assistance) to irregular forces and insurgent movements and the non-use of territory to attack other states.

In joining the Security Council support of the Secretary General's report and proposal to establish ONUCA, Ambassador Pickering elaborated on the position of the United States regarding ONUCA:

> The elements of Esquipulas are not a menu from which to pick and choose. The Esquipulas elements must be embraced, adhered to, and verified in their entirety. These elements include democratization, amnesty, national reconciliation, and free elections, as

well as cessation of lethal aid to irregular forces and insurgent movements and the non-use of territory to attack other states. These are all elements of the whole of the peace process.

The Secretary General's statement upon the Security Council's decision to establish ONUCA noted that shifting circumstances warranted careful review of ONUCA's personnel and requirements in order to be fully effective and suggested review and consultation with the Security Council following initial stages of deployment. Following late November budget meetings, the United Nations sent phase one of a four-phase ONUCA deployment to Central America on December 2.

At the December 10–12 summit meeting at San Isidro de Coronado, Costa Rica, the five Central American presidents' declaration called for an expanded ONUCA mandate to verify cease-fires, "reiterating their vigorous appeal to the FMLN immediately and effectively to cease hostilities." At the time of San Isidro, the Secretary General proposed to the Central American presidents a cease-fire verification model based on separation of forces and security enclaves, a model the United States considered workable. However, at year's end, cease-fires had not been negotiated, though hostilities were diminishing.

Resolution 637

By mid-summer, as Central American requests for UN assistance in the Esquipulas peace process increased and as the UN role deepened in Central America, the Security Council moved to support the Secretary General in his efforts.

Colombia and Algeria drafted a resolution that passed unanimously and with minimal friction. In his introduction, Security Council President Pejic, Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia, noted the broad general support for the resolution. The United States suggested changes to enhance and strengthen the resolution, emphasizing the need to keep the Central Americans at center stage in the peace process; the importance of democratization; and the need for close consultation between the Secretariat and the Security Council.

The final version of resolution 637 stated Security Council awareness of the importance which Central American presidents attached to the role of international verification as essential to the Esquipulas process, that Esquipulas comprised a harmonious and indivisible whole, noted appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary General, and expressed its "firmest support" for Esquipulas II.

In his statement following adoption of the resolution, Ambassador Pickering emphasized the centrality of Esquipulas and Tesoro in the achievement of peace and democracy in Central America; the crucial need for a free and fair election process in Nicaragua to unlock regional movement toward peace, democracy and development; and that Nicaragua and Cuba must cease supplies of lethal assistance to the FMLN and publicly support solely the use of political means and national reconciliation as provided for in Esquipulas.

Security Council President's Statement of December 8

At a November 30 meeting, requested on an urgent basis by El Salvador following an upsurge in violence there, Salvadoran Permanent Representative Castenada accused the Sandinistas of supplying arms to the FMLN and of violating regional peace accords. He said the peace accords could be rescued if the Security Council could verify the El Salvador complaint. He offered full cooperation with any fact-finding mission the Council might send.

Nicaraguan Permanent Respresentative Caldera, in his statement before the Security Council, said El Salvador formed part of the U.S. plan of aggression against Nicaragua. He called on the Council to take measures to guarantee human rights in El Salvador, to obtain immediate cease-fires, and to relaunch effective and substantive negotiations between the Government of El Salvador and the FMLN.

In the U.S. right of reply, Ambassador Pickering stated:

> The Sandinistas are clearly violating the Esquipulas and Tela accords in shipping arms and supplying weaponry to the FMLN. We appeal urgently to the Government of Nicaragua and to those who are supplying the suppliers to abide by the spirit of the Esquipulas accord.

Security Council President Penalosa of Colombia circulated a draft statement in response to El Salvador's concerns. The United States insisted that the letter go beyond El Salvador to encompass Central America, since Esquipulas II called for democratization and peace and the two were inextricably linked.

Brazil, on behalf of the NAM Security Council members, proposed a text that focused on the Central American peace process and the need to implement the agreements of the five Central American governments. The United States pressed for support of Esquipulas II and called for cease-fires, resumption of dialogue and a halt to arms transfers.

In the final language of the statement presented December 8, the Security Council President expressed grave concern over the present situation in Central America, particularly the sufferings of the civilian population; supported Esquipulas II; asserted the primary responsibility of the five Central American presidents to find solutions to regional problems; and appealed to all states, "including those with links to the region and interests in it, to refrain from all actions that could impede the achievement of a real and lasting settlement in Central America through negotiations."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly adopted without a vote on October 23 a resolution with broad Latin sponsorship titled "The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives." This resolution, updated from previous years to reflect support for the ongoing establishment of Esquipulas monitoring mechanisms, "requests the Secretary General to continue to afford the fullest possible support to the Central American Governments in their efforts to achieve peace." (Resolution 44/10.)

Nicaragua, Peru, Yugoslavia, France, Byelorussia, Japan, Cuba, Libya and the United States spoke. The United States stressed the need for verification of Esquipulas pledges; emphasized that voluntary demobilization was clearly linked to internal reforms in Nicaragua; and expressed concern regarding continuing arms transfers to the FMLN, highlighting the seizure of FMLN-bound arms shipments in Honduras October 18. Nicaragua accused the United States of interfering in Nicaragua's elections and of delaying demobilization.

ICJ Decision on Nicaragua

By vote of 91 to 2 (U.S.) with 41 abstentions, Nicaragua secured passage of a resolution calling for "full and immediate compliance" with the June 1986 International Court of Justice decision in the case of "Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua." Support for the resolution increased by two and absences or nonparticipation increased by seven over the previous year's resolution.

In his report on the item, the Secretary General noted that the International Court of Justice was in the process of deciding the form and amount of reparation owed by the United States to Nicaragua in accordance with its judgment of 27 June 1986 on the merits of the case and that the United States maintained the Court was without jurisdiction to entertain the dispute.

In its explanation of vote, the United States said the previous week's discovery of 24 surface-to-air missles in shipment from Nicaragua to Salvadoran guerrillas proved that Nicaragua's regional destabilization activities continued, thereby undermining the peace process; and that the United States fully respected and supported the International Court of Justice, but in this case the Court had erred in establishing jurisdiction.

The U.S. Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua

The Nicaraguan Delegation tabled a resolution in the Second Committee deploring the continuation of the U.S. trade embargo and seeking its immediate revocation. The United States reiterated its belief that this resolution, similar to those introduced at the past three General Assemblies, was inappropriate and further proof that the Sandinista regime was more interested in disrupting the work of the Second Committee than in serious dialogue. The United States rejected any implication that U.S. trade restrictions against Nicaragua were illegal or improper under international law. The United States also held that the Second Committee was an inappropriate forum for discussion of this issue. The Second Committee adopted the resolution by a margin of 78 in favor, 2 against (U.S. and Israel) and 32 abstentions. The resolution was subsequently adopted in the plenary session by a similar vote, 82 in favor, 2 against (U.S. and Israel) and 47 abstentions. (Resolution 44/217.)

In his statement to the Second Committee, Mr. Richard Devine, U.S. Economic Adviser to the Second Committee, said that the resolution was an attempt by the Sandinista government to shift attention away from its commitments to democratize and to end the use of its territory for subversion of other countries in the region. The plane crash near El Transito, El Salvador, and the discovery of weapons shipped from Nicaragua and destined for the Salvadoran guerrillas and the Sandinista military build-up on the Honduran border, he said, were indications of Nicaragua's real intentions. Mr. Devine concluded by noting that the economic impact of the U.S. economic measures was limited. Nicaragua's poor economic performance was largely the result of economic mismanagement, government expropriation without due process of law, internal political intimidation and subversion of its neighbors.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE LATIN AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

On October 17 the United States joined the General Assembly consensus adopting a resolution on cooperation with the Latin American Economic System (SELA), established by convention in 1975. The resolution (44/4) urges the Economic Commisson for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and the UN Development Program (UNDP) to broaden and deepen their cooperation with SELA and requests the UN Secretary General and the Permanent Secretary of SELA to initiate consultations for the purpose of drafting a cooperation agreement between the United Nations and SELA.

Cyprus

The Secretary General, assisted by his Special Representative for Cyprus Oscar Camilion, actively pursued his good offices mission during 1989. From January through June Cypriot President Vassiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash continued talks under UN auspices aimed at achieving substantial progress on a solution of the Cyprus problem. However, divisions emerged at mid-year on key substantive issues regarding the outline of an overall agreement. The last half of 1989 saw continued efforts by the Secretary General and his special representative to restart the negotiations, which were expected to resume in early 1990.

U.S. officials met with various Cypriot, Turkish and Greek officials throughout the year to underline continuing strong U.S. interest in helping to achieve a peaceful and enduring solution to the Cyprus question and demonstrate full U.S. support for the Secretary General's initiative.

The Security Council met twice during the year to renew the 6-month mandate of the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). On June 9 the Council unanimously adopted resolution 634, extending UNFICYP's mandate through December 15. The Council voted unanimously again on December 14 to renew the mandate until June 15, 1990. (Resolution 646.) Following adoption of the latter resolution, the President of the Security Council made the following statement on behalf of the Council:

> The members of the Security Council expressed their support for the continuing effort of the Secretary General in pursuing the initiative launched in August 1988. They recognized that a viable solution must satisfy the legitimate interests of both communities. They urged both leaders to proceed as suggested by the Secretary General in completing work on an outline of an overall agreement and to make a further determined effort to promote reconciliation.

The 44th General Assembly took no action on the agenda item "Question of Cyprus" carried over from previous years. This item, which has not been debated in the Assembly since 1983, was retained on the agenda for the 45th session.

DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

UN Disarmament Commission

The Disarmament Commission provides a subsidiary forum for deliberation on disarmament issues as mandated by the General Assembly, when the Assembly is not in session. It is a deliberative body and a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, whose function is to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament and to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session devoted to disarmament.

The 1989 session of the UNDC met in New York at the UN Headquarters from May 8–31. The Commission held eight plenary meetings under the chairmanship of Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire). Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Senior Political Affairs Officer, Department for Disarmament Affairs, served as Secretary of the Disarmament Commission. The Commission also elected eight vice-chairmen and a rapporteur of the 1989 Commission. The 1989 Bureau of the Commission was constituted as follows:

Chairman: Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire);

Vice-Chairmen were representatives from the following states: Austria, Haiti, Bahrain, Romania, Costa Rica, Sri Lanka, German Democratic Republic and Togo;

Rapporteur: Mr. Andre Querton (Belgium).

At its 133rd meeting on May 8, the Commission adopted the following seven substantive items for its agenda:

(1) Nuclear/Conventional Disarmament (Item 4);

(2) Reduction of Military Budgets (Item 5);

(3) Question of South Africa's Nuclear Capability (Item 6);

(4) Review of UN Role in Disarmament (Item 7);

(5) Naval Armaments and Disarmament (Item 8);

(6) Conventional Disarmament/Arms Transfers (Item 9);

(7) Declaration of 1990s as Third Disarmament Decade (Item 10).

At the same meeting, the Disarmament Commission also approved the following general program of work:

(1) Establish a committee of the whole for the consideration of agenda items 4, 11 and 12; with regard to item 4, a contact group was also established within the framework of the Committee of the Whole to consider the item;

(2) Establish informal consultations under the Chairman's responsibility to deal with agenda item 5;

(3) Establish Working Group I to deal with agenda item 6;

(4) Establish Working Group II to deal with agenda item 7;

(5) Establish Working Group III to deal with agenda item 9;

(6) Establish Working Group IV to deal with agenda item 10;

(7) Follow last year's course of action and hold, under the chairman's responsibility, substantive and open-ended consultations on agenda item 8.

Contact Group for Agenda Item 4 (Nuclear/Conventional Disarmament). Mr. Sergei Martynov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) once again chaired the contact group on item 4. The contact group held 12 meetings between May 10–26. Work on item 4 was based on the compilation of proposals for recommendations and a working paper entitled "Negotiations on Nuclear Disarmament," submitted by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. During the 1989 session, the contact group updated some of the texts under consideration, agreed on recommendation 4 which provides that the United States and the Soviets keep the General Assembly informed of the progress of all negotiations and made some progress towards narrowing areas of disagreement. Nevertheless, it was unable to reach a consensus on a complete set of recommendations. The contact group recommended that the Commission continue its efforts at the 1990 session toward reaching agreement on a complete set of recommendations relating to agenda item 4.

Consultation Group on Agenda Item 5 (Reduction of Military Budgets). The consultation group for agenda item 5 met under the chairmanship of Mr. Valeriu Florean (Romania). The group held six formal meetings and also conducted a number of informal meetings and consultations. The General Assembly had requested the Disarmament Commission to continue consideration of this item on "Reduction of Military Budgets" and to conclude at its 1989 substantive session its work on the last outstanding paragraph (paragraph 7) of the principles that govern further actions of states. However, there remained major differences among the delegations on paragraph 7. The chairman, supported by many non-aligned and Eastern countries, insisted that the mandate of the group was limited solely to the resolution of the issue of the utilization by states of the UN Standardized System for Reporting Military Expenditures, i.e., the partially bracketed last sentence in paragraph 7 of that paper, and that the rest of the paper had been agreed upon and could not be revisited. The United States and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, pointed out that, as stated in previous UNDC reports, other paragraphs in the paper had not been finalized, and insisted on the right to review them. Consequently, the consultation group was unable to reach agreement for paragraph 7, as well as on the text of the principles as a whole.

Working Group I on Agenda Item 6 (South Africa's Nuclear Capability). The working group met under the chairmanship of Ambassador Edmond Jayasinghe (Sri Lanka) and held 13 meetings. The working group decided that the working paper contained in the report of the Disarmament Commission submitted to the General Assembly at its 15th special session should continue to serve as the basic document for consideration of item 6 of the agenda of the Commission dealing with South Africa's nuclear capability. The group already had reached tentative agreement on 8 paragraphs of the working paper at previous meetings during the past sessions and decided to continue deliberations with the view of reaching agreement on the other 10. Written proposals based on the discussions on the remaining paragraphs were submitted by the Group of African States and other interested delegations (France, United States, United Kingdom). Although great efforts were made by all delegations to reach consensus on the remaining text, due to the divergence of views on the main issues of substance contained in some of the paragraphs under consideration, agreement was not possible at this stage.

Working Group II on Agenda Item 7 (Review of UN Role in Disarmament). This working group met under the chairmanship of Ambassador Paul Bamela Engo (Cameroon) and held three meetings. It was decided that Annex III to the special report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its Third Special Session Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD III) should provide the basis for deliberations, as well as selected elements of the chairman's paper from the SSOD III Working Group on this subject. After consultations, the chairman submitted a new working paper containing proposals resulting from those consultations. Some progress was made but substantial divergencies also remained. Owing to lack of time, the group was unable to fully address the new text and agreed to annex the chairman's working paper to the 1989 report of the Disarmament Commission in the belief that it would be useful in future deliberations and work of the Commission on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

Agenda Item 8 (Naval Armaments and Disarmament). As in previous sessions, this item was handled informally through consultations under the chairman's responsibility. The chairman delegated the actual conduct of the substantive and open-ended consultations to a "friend of the chairman," the Representative of Indonesia, Ambassador Nana Sutresna. The Consultation Group held seven meetings on the item. Once again the United States did not participate in the informal discussions, based upon the position that naval armaments cannot be considered in isolation from other military forces for the purposes of arms control. No conclusions were arrived at in these discussions.

Working Group III on Agenda Item 9 (Conventional Disarmament/Arms Transfers). The working group met under the chairmanship of Ambassador Skjold G. Mellbin (Denmark) and held 13 meetings. In carrying out its work, the working group had before it the Study on Conventional Disarmament, the views of the member states on the study and a number of working papers submitted by member states. Extensive discussions took place on the basis of a chairman's draft report and on proposals made orally by delegations. It did not prove possible to find agreement on the substantive content of the draft report. It was recommended to the General Assembly that the Commission continue its work on conventional disarmament at its next substantive session in 1990.

Working Group IV on Agenda Item 10 (Declaration of 1990s as Third Disarmament Decade). The working group met under the chairmanship of Ambassador Roger Ravix (Haiti) and held seven meetings. During its deliberations, the working group conducted an exchange of views on the characteristics, structure and elements of a future declaration. The working group also conducted informal consultations through the chairman during this period. The working group decided to establish an informal open-ended contact group, coordinated by Ambassador Douglas Roche (Canada), to elaborate the elements of a draft resolution to be entitled "Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade." The contact group met six times and prepared and circulated a conference room paper entitled, "Draft declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade" for consideration by the contact group. Using this document, the contact group attempted to identify points of convergence and present formulations in which the group might find consensus, but was unsuccessful in this endeavor. The working group recommended that the General Assembly give consideration to further action that might be taken.

The UNDC submitted its traditional report to the 44th General Assembly. The General Assembly adopted the UNDC Report in a consensus resolution (44/119 C) which requests the UNDC to meet for a period not exceeding 4 weeks during 1990 and to submit a substantive report to the 45th General Assembly.

Conference on Disarmament

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) is a forum for the consideration of and, as appropriate, negotiation on, multilateral arms control and disarmament issues. The CD has a membership of 40, including all five nuclear-weapon states and 35 other states. The CD is an autonomous body with its own rules of procedures and works by consensus. While not a UN body, it is linked to the United Nations in that a personal representative of the Secretary General serves as Secretary General of the Conference and the CD is funded through the regular UN budget. The Conference reports annually on its activities to the General Assembly, and resolutions adopted by the Assembly frequently request the Conference to consider specific disarmament matters.

The CD meets each year in a two-part session. In 1989 the Conference met from February 7–April 27, and June 13–August 31. The U.S. Representative to the CD was Ambassador Max Friedersdorf, who headed a delegation of officials drawn from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Departments of State, Defense and Energy, and the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During its 1989 session, the CD held 48 formal plenary meetings and 11 informal meetings. The CD invited 24 nonmembers to participate in the 1989 session. The CD's rules of procedure also provide that nonmember states may, on request, submit papers and make statements at formal plenary meetings, as well as at meetings of subsidiary bodies of the CD. Accordingly, during 1989, a number of nonmember states also participated in various Conference activities.

In accordance with rule 9 of the rules of procedure, the following member states assumed the Presidency of the Conference: Italy for February, Japan for March, Kenya for April and the recess between the first and second parts of the 1989 session of the Conference, Mexico for June, Mongolia for July and Morocco for August and the recess until the 1990 session of the Conference.

The CD addressed issues on its agenda and, among the wide range of disarmament issues considered during 1989, those items receiving the most attention were: nuclear test ban; chemical weapons; new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons; outer space arms control; nuclear disarmament; the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; negative security assurances and a comprehensive program of disarmament. Again the CD formed *ad hoc* committees to deal with some of the specific issues. Five *ad hoc* committees were reestablished from the 1988 session: negative security assurances, radiological weapons, comprehensive program of disarmament, chemical weapons and arms control in outer space.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Negative Security Assurances

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Negative Security Assurances reaffirmed that non-nuclear-weapon states should be effectively assured by the nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons pending effective measures of nuclear disarmament. Work on the substance of the effective arrangements and discussions on various aspects and elements of a solution, however, revealed that specific difficulties relating to differing perceptions of security interests of nuclear-weapon states and non-nuclear states persisted and that the complex nature of the issues involved continued to prevent agreement on a "common formula." The five nuclear-weapon states have offered unilateral assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon states; the U.S. assurances, first offered in 1978, stand as a reliable statement of U.S. policy.

Chemical Weapons

The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons was reestablished in February 1989 with a mandate to, *inter alia*, "continue the process of negotiations, developing and working out the convention, except for its final drafting . . . with a view to giving the conference a possibility to achieve an agreement as soon as possible." The 1989 report of the chemical weapons *Ad Hoc* Committee was adopted August 18, updating the "rolling text" of the convention to reflect work done in 1989.

In the CD negotiations in 1989 there was greater recognition of the need for a global approach to the problem of chemical weapons and more attention was given to security concerns. Progress on a variety of issues was registered, but there remain important issues which are as yet unresolved. The CD must still identify and negotiate detailed procedures necessary to assure adequate verification, including arrangements to monitor nonproduction of chemical weapons by civilian chemical industries. Also, the issue of how to ensure the security of states during the stockpile destruction period must be addressed. Finally, important differences remain on a number of issues such as treaty implementing provisions, allocation of costs, and the nature and extent of assistance that might be provided nations that have been attacked or are threatened by chemical weapons. CD participants began a series of trial inspections in the chemical industry. The results of three inspections organized by nations individually in their own industries has provided valuable insight into defining the regime for monitoring the civilian industry under a chemical weapons convention.

During 1989 chemical weapons negotiations were also the focus of U.S.-Soviet bilateral discussions designed to facilitate the multilateral negotiation. The chemical weapons negotiations were discussed at the U.S.-Soviet Ministerial in Wyoming in September, which resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on chemical weapons data exchange and visits and the Malta Summit meeting. In addition, pursuant to a 1985 summit agreement to accelerate chemical weapons negotiations, the United States and Soviet Union held bilateral meetings on chemical weapons treaty issues on the margins of the CD. Outside the CD, U.S.-Soviet bilateral sessions were held to discuss implementation of the MOU and ways to prevent the dangerous proliferation of chemical weapons. Moreover, the United States held informal talks with Western countries to discuss ways to optimize export controls on specific chemicals related to the manufacture of chemical weapons.

Comprehensive Program of Disarmament

The *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD) met again during 1989 to discuss "the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control." Despite intensive efforts and modest progress, the Committee was unable to resolve the numerous outstanding issues and recommended to the 44th General Assembly that the CPD exercise be discontinued until a more propitious time in the future.

Outer Space Arms Control

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space" was reestablished in 1989, with a non-negotiating mandate like that adopted in 1988. The *Ad Hoc* Committee adopted the following program of work for the 1989 session:

(1) Examination and identification of issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space;

(2) Existing proposals and future initiatives on the prevention of an arms race in outer space;

(3) Existing agreements relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

There is recognition in the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the importance of preventing an arms race in outer space and readiness to contribute to that objective. However, thus far, neither the United States nor the CD has been able to identify any outer space arms control issues appropriate for multilateral negotiations.

OTHER ISSUES

In addition to the work of the *ad hoc* committees, the Conference also addressed a number of other issues, including the following:

Nuclear Test Ban

As is customary, the agenda item on a "Nuclear Test Ban" was considered in plenary. In addition, efforts were made to find a basis to continue work on this item in an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference. While no delegation opposed the reestablishment of such a body, which has not met since 1983, there was no agreement on what its mandate should be; thus a committee was not established in 1989. There were several proposals on the table in this regard. The Western initiative, first put forward in 1984 by a number of Western states (CD/521), including the United States, proposed that such a committee be established to resume its substantive examination of specific issues relating to a nuclear test ban, including the issues of scope, verification and compliance, was still on the table. In 1985 the United States also joined other Western states in proposing a detailed program of work for a committee (CD/621), under the mandate proposed in CD/521, also still on the table. Proposals made by the G-21 group (CD/829) called for the multilateral negotiation of a nuclear test ban.

In 1988, Czechoslovakia, while serving as President of the CD, offered a proposal for CD consideration that could serve as the basis for developing a compromise mandate. The 1989 session ended without a clear indication that CD/863 was acceptable to the G-21 as a basis for establishing a compromise mandate; the West indicated that it was.

Prevention of Nuclear War, Including All Related Matters

This subject was first added to the CD agenda in 1983, as part of the nuclear disarmament agenda item. In 1984 the CD decided to accord it a separate place on the agenda. Over the last year, a wide range of views have been expressed in plenary consideration of this issue to determine how the Conference might best further treat it. The West continued to emphasize the need for preventing all wars (not just nuclear wars). Since there continues to be no agreement on establishing an *ad hoc* group, discussion on the issue is restricted to plenary discussions only.

Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament

This item was again discussed in both sessions of the CD in 1989. At the 523rd plenary meeting on August 3, after receiving a request from the Group–21, the President put before the Conference for a decision a proposal of that group for a draft mandate for the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. The West noted that they attached importance to this agenda item but felt that the most appropriate instrument for dealing with it now was in a plenary debate; no agreement was reached on establishing an *ad hoc* committee. The United States and the U.S.S.R. pointed to tangible progress in bilateral arms reduction's negotiations and emphasized the importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty for international security and stability.

Membership

In 1983 the Conference accepted in principle a limited expansion in its membership, not exceeding four states. A number of countries have submitted requests for membership including the following in order of request: Norway, Finland, Austria, Turkey, Senegal, Bangladesh, Spain, Viet Nam, Ireland, Tunisia, Ecuador, Cameroon, Greece, Zimbabwe and New Zealand. While the West has reached agreement on its candidate for membership (Norway), other groups have not reached consensus on candidates. Consultations on expanding the CD were again held in 1989 but there was no consensus on the proposed candidates.

General Assembly Consideration

Although the UN Charter adopted in 1945 gave no immediate priority to disarmament, it provides that the "General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments."

The advent of nuclear weapons came only weeks after the signing of the UN Charter, and provided immediate impetus to concepts of arms limitation and disarmament. In fact, the first resolution of the first meeting of the General Assembly (January 24, 1946) was entitled, "The Establishment of a Commission to Deal with the Problems Raised by the Discovery of Atomic Energy," and called upon the Commission to make specific proposals for "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction."

Since the early years of the United Nations, great-power disagreement has hampered efforts to promote arms control and disarmament within the UN system. However, the United Nations has undertaken continuing efforts to develop organizational machinery that can effectively address disarmament issues.

FIRST COMMITTEE DISARMAMENT ISSUES

The First Committee of the General Assembly convened from October 16 and continued its consideration of arms control and disarmament items until November 17. It completed its other work (Antarctica, international security items) on November 30. The First Committee holds general debates, considers specific aspects of arms control issues on its agenda, adopts resolutions on these issues and forwards them to the General Assembly for further action.

During its 1989 session, the Committee adopted a total of 61 resolutions (three others were tabled but not brought to a vote) and four decisions, mostly dealing with disarmament. These resolutions addressed nuclear weapons issues such as the nuclear freeze, non-first use of nuclear weapons, prevention of nuclear war and nuclear test ban, as well as such subjects as nuclear weapons testing, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, weapons transfers and conventional disarmament.

More specifically, the First Committee adopted three resolutions regarding followup actions relating to earlier disarmament studies. Resolution 44/116 F, introduced by Denmark, requested the UN Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of conventional disarmament (which had been the subject of an earlier report) at its 1990 session; it was adopted without a vote. Another resolution, introduced by Sweden, recalled the study on the naval arms race and requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of this subject at its 1990 session. This resolution was adopted in plenary by a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. (Resolution 44/116 M.) The United States voted against this resolution because, among other problems, we reject the notion that naval armaments can be examined independently without reference to land-based armaments as well. Resolution 44/116 N on international arms transfers, introduced by Colombia, was a followup to resolution 43/75 I which, *inter alia*, called for a UN study on this subject. The 1989 resolution invited states which had not yet done so to make their views and proposals on the subject available to the Secretary General. It also looked forward to the submission of the study to the 46th General Assembly. The United States supported the resolution, which was approved by the plenary by a vote of 143 (U.S.) to 0, with 12 abstentions.

Several resolutions were adopted by the First Committee that were intended to encourage international disarmament measures by focusing attention on the general questions involved, or on the institutional mechanisms available to the world community. These resolutions addressed such issues as: the observance of Disarmament Week, adopted without a vote (Resolution 44/119 G); a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, adopted without a vote (Resolution 44/116 Q); and international cooperation for disarmament, adopted by the plenary without a vote. (Decision 44/432 C.) With regard to the role of the United Nations in disarmament, in an explanation of vote, the United States recalled that, while joining consensus on the resolution, it did not accept the notion contained in the resolution that the United Nations has a central role in the field of disarmament.

Some resolutions dealt with restrictions on the use of certain types of weapons. Resolution 44/115 C dealt with the outcome of and followup activities related to the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, and was adopted without a vote.

The First Committee approved several hortatory resolutions emphasizing the obligation of member states to take concrete measures toward disarmament. Resolution 44/116 C, introduced by China, encouraged all states, including the "member states of the two major military alliances," to take appropriate steps to promote progress in conventional disarmament; it was adopted without a vote.

The United States opposed a resolution drafted by Peru on the subject "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale." Among other things, it asserted that resources consumed by conventional weapons could be used for social and economic development, urged nuclear-weapon and militarily-significant states to intensify their efforts to negotiate regional and subregional arms limitation measures, and appealed to states to refrain from any actions that would interfere with the objectives of regional disarmament. This resolution, 44/116 S, was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 119 to 1 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions. In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Delegate recalled U.S. support for the principle of conventional disarmament on a regional scale, but stressed that the United States was forced to vote against the resolution because it unduly emphasized nuclear disarmament over conventional weapons, despite the fact that that subject was not even mentioned in its title.

Resolution 44/116 G, introduced by Czechoslovakia, deemed it important that member states make every effort to facilitate the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament. It was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. The United States explained that it voted against this resolution, as it has in the past, on the grounds that General Assembly resolutions on disarmament are strictly recommendations and there is no basis in the Charter for according them any binding status.

In the area of transparency, a resolution on objective information on military matters, cosponsored by the United States and the United Kingdom and supported by the U.S.S.R. and its allies, was adopted in the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 132 (U.S.) to 0, with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 44/116 E.)

A number of new resolutions were introduced in 1989. Costa Rica submitted a draft resolution entitled "Education for general and complete disarmament." It was revised on November 8 and the title was changed to "Education for disarmament." Proceeding from the paragraph of the final document of the 10th special session on disarmament (1978) that urged programs on disarmament and peace education, invited member states and NGOs to inform the Secretary General about their efforts in this area, requested the Secretary General to report on the current state of education for disarmament and to submit it to the 46th General Assembly. The draft resolution was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 149 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 44/123.) The U.S. explanation of vote questioned the purpose of calling for more reports from the Secretariat and noted that the proper place of disarmament in the maintenance of international peace and security, and the role of the United Nations in disarmament, have become subject to considerable difference of views. The United States disagreed with the call to publicize the final document of the 10th special session, and any obligation to respond to requests made in that document.

Another new subject was a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria (later joined by the German Democratic Republic) on the subject "Conversion of military resources." The resolution expressed the view that an exchange of experience, within the UN framework, should be promoted on modalities for the conversion of military resources to civilian purposes, and invited member states to submit to the Secretary General by April 1991 their views on various aspects of conversion. The plenary approved the resolution by a vote of 153 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.). (Resolution 116 J.) The United States objected to the presumption in the resolution that states dictate what is produced by industry. In states with free economies, any conversion would be by private industry, whose plans would be governed by market considerations.

Another new resolution in 1989 was a draft submitted by the German Democratic Republic, along with Poland, the U.S.S.R. and Byelorussia, entitled "Security concepts and policies aimed exclusively at defense." The resolution considered that the development of an international dialogue on security concepts and policies aimed exclusively at defense to be of great importance in achieving disarmament and strengthening international security. It recommended that states initiate and intensify the dialogue on this matter at all levels and keep the General Assembly informed about progress achieved. The draft was revised on November 8 and the title modified to "Defensive security concepts and policies." The draft was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 131 to 0, with 19 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 116 P.)

In addition, the Committee adopted and forwarded to the General Assembly a considerable number of resolutions of special interest. These are treated in greater detail in the following sections.

PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

Since 1981 non-aligned countries have proposed resolutions in the General Assembly expressing the urgent need to take steps to prevent nuclear war and calling on the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations to that end.

The Argentine resolution was introduced on October 30. It requested the Conference on Disarmament, once again, to establish an *ad hoc* committee on nuclear disarmament and one on the prevention of nuclear war.

The Argentine resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 10 and by the Assembly plenary on December 15 by 138 to 11 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution because it attempted to ascribe to the First Committee authority reserved to the Conference on Disarmament to decide its own work program, and because the United States believes it is necessary to prevent all wars, not just nuclear war. (Resolution 44/119 E.)

The German Democratic Republic also introduced its resolution on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war (Resolution 44/119 D), discussed in greater detail in the section on the non-use of nucelar weapons.

RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Since 1979 when the United States and the Soviet Union submitted a joint proposal on the major elements of a treaty to ban the development, production, stockpiling, and use of radiological weapons, to the Conference on Disarmament, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions supporting the negotiation of such a convention. These resolutions for the most part have been adopted each year without a vote.

The 1989 version of the resolution on a radiological weapons convention was tabled on October 28 ty Peru and was cosponsored by Byelorussia, the U.S.S.R., the Netherlands and Sweden. It was largely procedural and essentially similar to its predecessors. The resolution recognized the utility of the work performed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during 1989 and requested the Conference on Disarmament to continue its negotiations toward a convention to ban radiological weapons. The resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee on November 13, and in the plenary on December 15. (Resolution 44/116 T.)

As in previous years, Iraq tabled its own resolution on radiological weapons on October 30, with Libya, Yemen and Jordan as cosponsors. Asserting that Israel's 1981 attack on an Iraqi nuclear facility constituted an unprecedented danger to international peace and security, the resolution declared that military attacks of any kind against nuclear installations were "tantamount to the use of radiological weapons" and requested the Conference on Disarmament to reach early agreement on the prohibition of such attacks. The United States voted against this resolution because of its one-sided criticism of Israel and because the United States neither accepts the premise that a treaty banning radiological weapons should deal with attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities nor has concluded that additional legal measures for protection against attacks on nuclear facilities are appropriate. The U.S. Delegate explained the American view in the following explanation of vote:

> . . . The resolution seeks to define any attack on any type of nuclear facility as tantamount to the use of radiological warfare, a judgment that we do not share. Moreover, the United States has not concluded that military attacks on nuclear facilities should be subject to additional legal measures. In our view, [the] resolution . . . prejudices the outcome of discussions on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament. Moreover, the text of this resolution is technically inaccurate in its argument. In operative paragraph 1, it indicates that an armed attack against a nuclear facility would necessarily lead to the release of "dangerous radioactive forces." This is simply not so.

The Iraqi resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 104 to 2 (U.S.), with 28 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 15 by a vote of 124 to 2 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. (Resolution 44/116 A.)

DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The question of a relationship between disarmamant and development was first considered at the first special session on disarmament (SSOD-I) in 1978 and has been the subject of General Assembly resolutions in recent years. In 1983, on the initiative of President Mitterrand of France, the Assembly adopted a resolution which placed the issue on the UN Disarmament Commission's 1984 agenda. The 39th General Assembly (1984) adopted a resolution, introduced by France, which decided to convene an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development in 1986 and which also established a 54-member Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). Although the United States did not break the consensus adoption of this resolution, it did not participate in the work of the PrepCom when it first met in August 1985, because of skepticism about the usefulness of the proposed conference.

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution that recommended acceptance of a provisional agenda submitted by the PrepCom for the conference and set 1986 as the year for convening the conference in Paris. The United States decided in April 1986 that it would not attend the conference because the United States does not accept the premise that there is necessarily a causal relationship between disarmament in the developed world and development in the developing world. Two months later, in response to a request by France, the resumed session of the 40th General Assembly formally deferred the conference until 1987.

In accordance with a "decision" adopted without a vote by the 41st General Assembly in 1986, the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development was held at UN Headquarters in New York from August 24 to September 11, 1987. Consistent with its policy decision of April 1986, the United States did not participate in the Assembly's adoption of this "decision," nor did it participate in the conference itself. The conference adopted a "final document" and a program of action which ran counter to several aspects of U.S. policy.

On October 30 at the 44th General Assembly Yugoslavia, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, circulated a draft resolution on "The Relationship Between Disarmament and Development." The resolution requested the Secretary General "to take action through the appropriate organs, within available resources, for the implementation of the action program as adopted at the International Conference" and to submit a report to the 45th General Assembly.

Not only does the United States not accept the basic premise of a purported relationship between disarmament and development, but the United States was also particularly troubled by the resolution's request to the Secretary General to take steps to implement the conference's program of action. Prior to the First Committee's consideration of and action on the Yugoslav resolution, the U.S. Representative explained why the United States was not participating in this action:

> The U.S. Delegation wishes to announce that we will not participate in whatever action the First Committee will take on draft resolution L.32. As everyone knows, . . . the United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked.
>
> Consequently, the United States declined to participate in the international conference on this matter. For this reason, the U.S. Delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of or action on draft resolution L.32. At the same time, our delegation takes this opportunity to state that the U.S. Government does not and will not consider itself bound or committed in any way by either the declarations in the "Final Document" of the international conference or committed to the terms of draft resolution L.2.

The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 9. The Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 44/116 L.)

INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The 44th General Assembly and its First Committee considered several initiatives of a largely institutional nature. On October 30, Nigeria introduced its traditional resolution on the UN program of disarmament fellowships. An essentially procedural resolution, it recalled and reaffirmed the decision of the second special session on disarmament (SSOD II) to increase the number of fellowships from 20 to 25. The resolution asked the Secretary General to implement the program within existing resources and also expressed appreciation to those governments, such as the United States, which had hosted the disarmament fellows in 1989. A revision was tabled on November 3 to clarify the stipulation that the program be conducted within existing financial resources. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 9 and was approved by the General Assembly on December 15, both times without a vote. (Resolution 44/117 E.)

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. The Center was inaugurated in Lome, Togo, on October 24, 1986. In 1986 the 41st General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America. The Center was inaugurated on October 9, 1987 in Lima, Peru. At the 43rd General Assembly, on October 31 Nepal introduced a draft resolution which recalled the 1987 General Assembly resolution establishing a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Asia. It commended the administrative support given by the Secretary General to the Center and invited member states and interested organizations to make voluntary contributions to assist the Center's functioning.

In a followup action, Peru, Nepal and Togo submitted a resolution on October 30 in the Committee which welcomed the inauguration of the three Centers, appealed for voluntary contributions to maintain them, and established the post of director-general at each Center as soon as practicable. A revised version tabled on November 14 requested the Secretary General to establish the posts "as soon as practicable." The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 16 by a vote of 130 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 abstention, and by the General Assembly on December 15, by a vote of 153 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 44/117 F). The U.S. Representative explained the U.S. vote as follows:

> While we support the concept of regional disarmament centers, we are obliged to consider the financial implications of initiatives we might otherwise welcome. The three regional disarmament centers the resolution refers to were established on the understanding that they would be financed on the basis of voluntary contributions. Yet the draft resolution would unfortunately create new financial burdens for the United Nations, which the 1990–1991 budget does not provide for . . . .

As in previous years Yugoslavia, on October 30, tabled a resolution on the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament. Rather than being merely a procedural text designed to take note of the report of the CD, which had been adopted by consensus, the resolution again urged the Conference to undertake substantive negotiations on various disarmament questions which the United States does not consider appropriate for multilateral negotiation, such as a nuclear test ban. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 119 to 7 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 15 by a vote of 138 to 8 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 44/119 D.)

Another institutional resolution was introduced by Zaire on October 27. It took note of the annual report of the UN Disarmament Commission and requested the Commission to continue its work in 1990 in accordance with its mandate and "to make every effort to achieve specific recommendations . . . on the outstanding items on its agenda, taking into account the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly." The novelty of the 1989 resolution was that it included an annex containing a number of recommendations of a "friends of the Chairman" group regarding improvements in the functioning of the Commission. These recommendations, which include such measures as a 3-year limit for consideration of a specific item, do not have any status unless affirmative action is taken by the Commission at its 1990 session. A revised version was tabled on November 14; it was orally revised on November 16. That day, it was approved by the First Committee without a vote. It was also approved by the plenary without a vote on December 15. (Resolution 44/119 C.)

BILATERAL NUCLEAR-ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

The General Assembly has passed several resolutions over the years dealing with the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on nuclear arms reductions. The resolutions generally have welcomed the conclusion of previous negotiations and urged the two participants to undertake further efforts in this field. At the 43rd General Assembly, interest in this issue was heightened in the First Committee following the ratification and the coming into force of the U.S.-Soviet Intermediate Range Nuclear forces (INF) Treaty designed to eliminate an entire class of weapons. Two resolutions which dealt with these negotiations were adopted by the Committee.

As in previous years, the United Kingdom took the lead in presenting the Western viewpoint on the bilateral talks in a resolution which was also designed to be acceptable to all states. Introduced in the First Committee on October 30, it welcomed the U.S.-Soviet INF Treaty and called upon the two governments to "spare no effort" in attaining their agreed objectives in the negotiations. The U.K. resolution also expressed the "firmest possible encouragement and support for the bilateral negotiations and their successful conclusion." The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 71 (U.S.) to 0, with 64 abstentions, and by the General Assembly on December 15 by 91 (U.S.) to 0, with 61 abstentions. (Resolution 44/116 B.)

On behalf of the non-aligned countries, Yugoslavia introduced a resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations" on October 30. It welcomed the ratification of the U.S.-Soviet INF Treaty, and urged efforts to achieve a 50 percent reduction in strategic arms, while insisting on the "complementarity" of bilateral and multilateral arms negotiations and warning of the "continuing escalation" of the arms race. A revised version submitted on November 9 was approved by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 141 to 0, with 12 abstentions (U.S.), and by the plenary on December 15, by a vote of 134 to

0, with 18 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 44/116 K.) In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative noted that, while the resolution was less argumentative in tone than its predecessors, and more consistent with the current atmosphere of cooperation, nevertheless:

> At the same time, we regret that this resolution still suffers from some fundamental flaws, which prevent the United States from supporting it. For example, we believe that the United States and Soviet nuclear and space talks should be carried out on the basis agreed by the parties and that it is not appropriate for others to attempt to amend this process. The call for an urgent agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban is also inconsistent with the approach underlying the bilateral negotiations on nuclear testing issues. Furthermore, the language of the resolution . . . creates the impression that only nuclear war is the threat, whereas we believe the objective should be to reduce the threat of any war.

On October 30 China also introduced a resolution which, although entitled "Nuclear disarmament," was largely focused on the U.S.-Soviet negotiations. Like the other resolutions on this subject, it welcomed the signing and ratification by the two governments of a treaty eliminating their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The resolution further urged the United States and the Soviet Union "to take the lead in halting the nuclear-arms race and to accelerate negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction of their nuclear arsenals." It also stated that bilateral and multilateral efforts for nuclear disarmament should complement and facilitate each other. The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 10. It was adopted by the plenary, also without a vote, on December 15. (Resolution 44/116 D.)

NON-USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The 44th General Assembly, as had previous assemblies, adopted two resolutions concerning non-use of nuclear weapons. On October 30, on behalf of 13 cosponsors, India submitted a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons," which paralleled similar resolutions it has introduced since 1978. As in earlier resolutions, this draft criticized nuclear deterrence and declared that "the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity." It requested "the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations . . . on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances." The resolution also incorporated the text of a proposed convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The United States once again opposed the resolution on the grounds that the UN Charter provides no basis for such a declaration, and it neither prohibits the use of force in self-defense nor outlaws nuclear weapons for defense or deterrence. The United States also pointed out that in many parts of the world, nuclear weapons are a central part of security arrangements that have maintained peace.

On November 10 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 113 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution December 7 by a vote of 134 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 44/117 C.)

On October 26, the German Democratic Republic, along with five cosponsors, introduced its traditional resolution entitled, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war." It welcomed the declarations on non-first use of nuclear weapons made by two nuclear-weapon states. The resolution appealed to those nuclear-weapon states which have not yet done so to consider making similar declarations renouncing first use of nuclear weapons. It also requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider "the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." The United States, as in past years, opposed this resolution in part because the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons is contrary to nuclear deterrence.

On November 10, after the draft was revised, the First Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 106 to 16 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. On December 7 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 129 to 17 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 44/119 B.)

NUCLEAR FREEZE

The 44th General Assembly considered and adopted an Indian resolution calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons. India's resolution, which had 7 cosponsors, was submitted on October 30. A revised version was tabled on November 13. It welcomed improvements in the international security environment, and stated the conviction that a nuclear freeze, while "not an end in itself," would be an effective step to prevent quantitative and qualitative increases in nuclear weapons during further negotiations on nuclear arms reductions. Consequently, it urged a total stoppage in further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. The resolution also called for a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. All these measures would be subject to "appropriate and effective measures and procedures of verification." Finally, the resolution called upon the nuclear weapons states to report to the 44th General Assembly on its implementation.

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee November 15 by a vote of 115 to 13 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The General Assemtly approved it on December 15 by a vote of 136 to 13 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. Mexico was one of the cosponsors and did not present its own traditional nuclear freeze resolution. The United States traditionally opposes these resolutions for a number of reasons, such as the view that a freeze on the production and testing of nuclear weapons would undermine such Western defense concepts as deterrence and flexible response. (Resolution 44/117 D.)

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

At the 44th General Assembly, three resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of chemical and biological weapons, a reflection of the continuing concern within the international community over reports of the use and proliferation of such weapons.

On October 30 Australia submitted a draft resolution entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva protocol and to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention" to the First Committee. A revised draft was tabled on November 15, with 33 cosponsors, including the United States and U.S.S.R. The document expressed deep dismay at the use of chemical weapons and at the risk of further use, recalled relevant Security Council resolutions, renewed the call to all states to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol and vigorously condemned all actions in violation of that obligation, called upon all states that have not done so to accede to the Protocol, urged the Conference on Disarmament to pursue negotiations toward a global ban on chemical weapons development, production, stockpiling and destruction, and requested the UN Secretary General to carry out promptly investigations of reports of use of chemical and bacteriological or toxin weapons in violation of the Geneva Protocol or other rules of customary international law. In addition, it welcomed proposals of the group of qualified experts called into being by the Secretary General for the conduct of timely and efficient investigation of reports of chemical or bacteriological weapons use.

After an oral revision November 17, the draft was approved that day without a vote. The plenary also approved the resolution without a vote on December 15. Thus, for the third straight year, the resolution was adopted by consensus, demonstrating widespread concern over chemical weapons use. (Resolution 44/115 B.)

Canada and Poland introduced their traditional draft resolution on October 30 in the First Committee on the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a chemical weapons convention which was similar to others introduced by the two countries and adopted by consensus over the past several years. Cosponsored by 35 states, including the United States and U.S.S.R., it welcomed broad participation in the January 1989 Paris Conference on chemical weapons use, urged the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations on a chemical weapons convention during its 1990 session and to use the momentum generated by the Paris Conference to conclude a convention at the earliest possible date. The resolution was revised on November 15. It was adopted without a vote in both the First Committee (November 17) and in the plenary (December 15). (Resolution 44/115 A.)

Another resolution, dealing with biological weapons and cosponsored by 38 states, including the United States and the Soviet Union, was submitted by

Austria on October 30. It recalled the work of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction , which took place in Geneva in September 1986. The resolution noted with satisfaction that in accordance with the Review Conference's Final Declaration, an *Ad Hoc* Meeting of Scientific and Technical Experts met in March/April 1987 and adopted a report establishing the means for an exchange of information and data among parties to the convention. The resolution called upon all states to provide information on an annual basis, welcomed the accession of over 100 states to the convention, and called on remaining states to ratify or accede to the convention without delay. The resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 9) and in the plenary (December 15). (Resolution 44/115 C.)

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

In 1989 the 44th General Assembly considered and adopted three resolutions dealing with nuclear testing issues.

A resolution entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions" was submitted in the First Committee by Mexico on October 30 and cosponsored by 10 other states. Describing a nuclear weapons-test-ban treaty as a matter of the "highest priority," the resolution again called upon the members of the Conference on Disarmament at its 1990 session to establish an *ad hoc* committee for the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty and recommended the creation of two CD working groups to deal with the contents and scope of such a treaty, and with compliance and verification. The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 16 by a vote of 117 to 3 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions, and the plenary followed suit on December 15 by a vote of 136 to 3 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution because it is in contradiction to our policy on nuclear testing. (Resolution 44/105.)

On October 30, Mexico, along with six cosponsors, submitted a second resolution under the title, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water." After recalling in its resolution of the previous General Assembly (Resolution 43/63 B), in which it was noted that, the preamble of the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), there were international calls for measures to end the nuclear-arms race, and citing the procedure in Article II of the LTBT for its amendment, the resolution noted that the requisite one-third of the states party to the treaty had requested the convening of a conference. Furthermore, the resolution recommended the establishment of a preparatory committee to make arrangements for the conference to meet at UN Headquarters from May 29–June 1, 1990, followed by a 1-week session of the conference from June 4–8 and a second substantive session January 7–18, 1990. It also recommended that costs for the conference be shared according to the UN scale of assessments.

The United States did not support the amendment or the call for a conference and believed the convening of the conference, under LTBT Article II was a matter for the parties, not the United Nations.

The resolution was controversial, and separate votes were taken on a number of paragraphs. The third preambular paragraph, which asked the nuclear weapon states to engage in a test moratorium pending agreement on a comprehensive test ban, was approved by the First Committee on November 17 by a vote of 116 to 6 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The phrase "at UN Headquarters" was added to operative paragraph one (dealing with the site of a preparatory committee meeting) and was adopted by a vote of 105 to 9, with 14 abstentions. Operative paragraph one as a whole was adopted by a vote of 106 to 10, with 13 abstentions. Operative paragraph two, dealing with apportionment of expenses, was approved by a vote of 105 to 9, with 14 abstentions. The United States did not participate in any operative paragraph votes, deeming the resolution an inappropriate vehicle for decision-making. The U.S.S.R., which voted in favor of the entire resolution, abstained on votes on operative paragraphs one and two. For similar reasons the United Kingdom voted against the resolution. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 108 to 3 (U.S., U.K.), with 21 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 15 by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S., U.K.), with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 44/106.)

In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative noted the following:

> The United States does not believe that a conference to amend the Limited Test Ban Treaty is an appropriate or practical approach to the subject of a complete test ban. We are fundamentally opposed to that approach. We have expressed our view again in our vote on resolution L. 25/Rev. 1. Although our national position is one in opposition to the proposed conference, we are mindful of our duties as a Depositary of the Treaty. In this regard, the United States, together with the other two Depositaries, has arranged for the requested conference to be convened in Geneva on January 8, 1991, for a period of up to 2 weeks, and the United States has transmitted its notification to this effect to all Parties to the Treaty.

A third resolution entitled, "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty," was again submitted by Australia and New Zealand, along with 26 other cosponsors (two others were subsequently added), on October 30. A revision was tabled on November 15. Reaffirming that a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-test explosions was "a matter of fundamental importance," the text urged the Conference on Disarmament to "initiate substantive work on all aspects of a nuclear-test-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1990 session," and called upon the nuclear-weapon states to "agree to appropriate, verifiable and militarily significant interim measures" to help promote the conclusion of such a treaty. In addition, the resolution urged the CD to take steps to establish an international seismic monitoring network to assist in monitoring and verifying compliance with a test-ban treaty, taking into account progress achieved by the

Group of Scientific Experts. The draft was approved in the First Committee on November 16 by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions, and adopted in the plenary on December 15 by a vote of 145 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 44/107.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U.S. Delegate explained that the United States was unable to support the resolution because:

> [I]t is fundamentally inconsistent with the U.S. position on the issue of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. A comprehensive test ban would not necessarily prevent proliferation, reduce armaments, stop production of any weapon, or ensure any lessening of an arms race. Improved stability is the most direct means of improving security, and that is what we are seeking through reductions of strategic and conventional forces and the implementation of confidence-building measures.
>
> The United States carries out nuclear tests to ensure the reliability of our nuclear deterrent, and a comprehensive ban on those tests must be viewed in the context of a time when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability.

CUT-OFF OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL FOR WEAPONS PURPOSES

On October 30, along with 21 other cosponsors, Canada submitted in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes." The resolution was similar to others introduced by Canada in previous years. It considered that the "cessation of production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons . . . would be a significant step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race" and that the "prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices would be an important "measure" in helping prevent nuclear proliferation. It requested the Conference on Disarmament to pursue its consideration, at an appropriate stage, of the "adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 10 by a vote of 126 to 1, with 6 abstentions (U.S). On December 15 it was adopted by the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 147 to 1, with 6 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained on this resolution because the United States does not consider it realistic to pursue such negotiations in the near term in part due to the extreme difficulty of verifying a cutoff in the production of such materials. (Resolution 44/116 H.)

WORLD DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN

The World Disarmament Campaign, a Mexican initiative, stemmed from the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; it calls for "mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament." The United States expressed two principal concerns when the campaign was first proposed in 1980. First, we had serious doubts that the Soviet

Union and other totalitarian governments would permit any free discussion of international security or disarmament issues. Second, we noted that it was not the function of the United Nations or of governments in democratic societies to "mobilize" public opinion.

In 1982, at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, the United States joined in a consensus adopting a plan for a World Disarmament Campaign. The campaign would be carried out "in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner." The United States has made clear its expectation that the campaign would be financed out of existing funds and voluntary contributions, and not through any increase in the UN-assessed budget.

On October 27 Mexico submitted to the First Committee a draft resolution entitled, "World Disarmament Campaign." The resolution, with 15 cosponsors, urged states that had not done so, especially those with the largest military expenditures, to make an initial financial contribution to the campaign. It resolved that there should be an eighth pledging conference for the World Disarmament Campaign at the 45th General Assembly. Finally, it requested the Secretary General report to the 45th General Assembly on both the achievements and shortcomings of the campaign, as well as on the implementation of its activities.

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 9 by a vote of 117 to 0, with 9 abstentions (U.S.). The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 15 by a vote of 144 to 0, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 44/117 A.) In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative pointed out the following:

> . . . [O]perative paragraph 4 is inaccurate and inappropriate, because most of the states which have the largest military expenditures do indeed make financial contributions to the World Disarmament Campaign through their UN assessed contributions. That paragraph is inappropriate because, by definition, voluntary contributions cannot be contributions made under duress, and language applying such pressure should not appear in a UN resolution. Regrettably, we must abstain on this resolution because of its financial implications, as well as the paragraph I previously mentioned. Under the decision taken by the second special session on disarmament, the campaign was to be financed solely from voluntary contributions. It is not. A substantial part of the funding of this campaign now comes from UN-assessed contributions.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS

Romania's traditional resolution, introduced on October 30 by eight cosponsors, reaffirmed the conviction that resources released through the reduction of military expenditures could be reallocated to the economic and social development of all states, particularly the developing countries. It welcomed the work of the Disarmament Commission in elaborating "a set of principles that should govern the further action of states in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets, took note of those principles, presented as an annex to the resolution, and decided to bring them to the attention of member states and of the Conference on Disarmament as useful guidelines for further action in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets.

The First Committee approved this draft resolution on November 16 by a vote of 94 to 10 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions and it was adopted by the General Assembly plenary on December 15 by a vote of 116 to 10 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions. (Resolution 44/114 A.) The United States explained why it could not support the resolution in the following terms:

> The draft resolution ignores the fact, which is reflected in the report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly, that the text attached to the draft resolution is not an agreed text. [The draft resolution] seeks to give validity to that text, which was not agreed upon, by referring it to member states and to the Conference on Disarmament as containing "useful guidelines for further action." Moreover, according to the text, the Secretary General is asked to report on the implementation of this draft resolution. The draft resolution represents an unacceptable attempt to circumvent the outcome of the Disarmament Commission's deliberations on the subject of the reduction of military budgets and we must therefore vote against it.

A second resolution, entitled, "Military budgets," was submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany and eight other states. It noted that further progress in disarmament negotiations could also lead to reductions in military expenditures, recalled that the General Assembly had introduced a standardized system for military expenditure reporting in 1980, and called upon all states to make use of this reporting system. The draft was approved on November 16 by a vote of 105 to 0, with 16 abstentions in the First Committee and by a vote of 127 (U.S.) to 0, with 15 abstentions in the plenary on December 15. (Resolution 44/114 B.)

NEGATIVE SECURITY ASSURANCES

Non-nuclear-weapon states have long sought guarantees from the nuclear-weapon states that, in exchange for their renunciation of nuclear arms, the nuclear-weapon states would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. These guarantees have been referred to as "negative security assurances." During the first special session on disarmament in 1978, each of the five nuclear-weapon states, in an effort to meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon states, issued a unilateral statement offering some form of negative security assurance. Then-Secretary of State Vance made the following statement on behalf of the President (since reiterated by President Reagan):

> The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining the attack.

Since 1980, an *ad hoc* committee has addressed the question of negative security assurances at the Conference on Disarmament. It has, however, been unable to reach agreement on effective international arrangements.

The United States is a signatory to Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is intended to provide security assurances by nuclear-weapon states to members of the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone. While pointing out that the U.S. assurances stand as a reliable and valid statement of U.S. policy, the United States has also indicated its willingness to discuss the possibility of developing a common form of negative security assurance that would both safeguard the security requirements of each of the nuclear-weapon states and their respective allies, and meet the desires of all non-nuclear-weapon states.

As in previous years, Pakistan and Bulgaria each sponsored resolutions on negative security assurances in the First Committee at the 44th General Assembly. The Pakistani resolution, cosponsored by Iran, Madagascar, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka, was submitted on October 30. Entitled, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons," the draft was essentially along lines similar to previous years. It reaffirmed "the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." It noted "with satisfaction" that there is no objection in principle in the Conference on Disarmament to the idea of an international convention to assure non-nuclear weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the resolution appealed to all states, especially the nuclear-weapon states, to demonstrate "political will" to reach agreement on a "common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character." In addition, the Pakistani text recommended that the Conference on Disarmament actively continue negotiations toward reaching such an agreement on negative security assurances.

The United States abstained on Pakistan's resolution, on the grounds that the feasibility of reaching effective international arrangements depended on more than just the political will of states. On November 13 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 133 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary on December 15 adopted the resolution by a vote of 151 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 44/111.)

Bulgaria's resolution, cosponsored by Nigeria and introduced on October 30, pointed out the need for a "fresh look" at the issue, in order to resolve previous difficulties in negotiations. It reaffirmed the "urgent need" to reach effective international arrangements on negative security assurances, recommended that the Conference on Disarmament pursue intensive negotiations in the appropriate *ad hoc* committee on the issue, appealed to all states, particularly the nuclear weapon states, to demonstrate the willingness and exercise the flexibility necessary to reach a common approach to a legally binding instrument to assure non-nuclear weapon states against the threat or use of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 7 by a vote of 113 to 0, with 16 abstentions (U.S.). On December 15 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 131 to 0, with 21 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 44/110.)

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DISARMAMENT

For nearly 10 years, an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been negotiating a draft document on a Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD). Each year, the General Assembly has, in its turn, adopted by consensus a Mexican resolution on the CPD.

At the 41st UN General Assembly, Mexico introduced in the First Committee a draft "decision" by which the CPD agenda item would be kept open "in order to allow the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the elaboration of a comprehensive program of disarmament during the first part of its 1987 session and to submit a complete draft of the program to the (41st) General Assembly at that time." The First Committee and the plenary adopted this "decision" without a vote.

By the time of the 42nd General Assembly, the CD had not yet completed its work on the CPD. Mexico again took the lead in introducing a resolution on this subject in the First Committee. It regretted that the Conference on Disarmament was unable to complete the elaboration of the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament in time to submit a finished draft to the General Assembly prior to the conclusion of its 41st session. The resolution urged the CD to resume its work on the CPD at the outset of its 1988 session, "with a view to resolving outstanding issues," so that the Conference could submit a completed draft to the General Assembly at its third special session on disarmament (SSOD III). The matter remained unresolved. At the 44th General Assembly, Mexico submitted its draft resolution on the subject on October 26; a revised version was tabled on November 8. Recalling the previous year's resolution urging the CD to resume work on the CPD at the outset of its 1989 session, and having examined the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the CPD, considering that the conclusion of the elaboration of the comprehensive program of disarmament would constitute an "important contribution" to the success of the Third Disarmament Decade, it called upon the Conference on Disarmament to consider, at the beginning of its 1991 session, the resumption of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament with the aim of resolving the outstanding issues in order to conclude the elaboration of the program and inscribed the issue on the agenda of the 46th General Assembly.

The Mexican resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 16 by a vote of 129 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.), and by the General Assembly plenary on December 15, by a vote of 154 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.). Operative paragraph 1, calling on the Conference on Disarmament to consider resumption of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament in 1991, was approved by a separate vote of 112 to 0, with 17 abstentions (U.S.) in the First Committee and by a vote of 137 to 0, with 17 abstentions (U.S.) in the plenary. (Resolution 44/119 A). The United States abstained on the resolution largely because it sought to prejudge in its operative paragraph 1 the decision the Conference on Disarmament may take when to resume work on a CPD. Explaining the U.S. abstention, Ambassador Max Friedersdorf remarked that:

> The United States believes it is important to note that in its report to the General Assembly at its current session, the Conference on Disarmament agreed by consensus that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament would resume work with a view to resolving the outstanding issues in the near future when conditions were more conducive to progress in that regard. The Conference on Disarmament has indicated that progress on the development of a CPD thus is not as far-reaching as resolution L.2 would suggest....
>
> This draft resolution also prejudges the role of the CPD in the context of the Third Disarmament Decade, especially since the text of a declaration on the objectives of the Third Disarmament Decade has yet to be developed and agreed.
>
> The United States regrets that, for these reasons, it cannot support this resolution, as it has in years past. This is particularly unfortunate as the United States has put diligent efforts into the work on a CPD in the CD. In fact, we are rather surprised that the resolution's main sponsor found it possible to propose a text inconsistent with that Committee's recommendation.

NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONES

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) dates back to the 1950's. The United States supports the NWFZ concept as a non-proliferation measure when such a zone would effectively promote regional stability and global security but opposes zones which would erode nuclear deterrence or erode existing security arrangements.

Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco

The most significant NWFZ agreement to date is the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which entered into force in 1968 and which, coupled with its two protocols, provides for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. Protocol I, which is open to adherence by non-Latin American states that administer territory within the over 7.5 million-square-mile area, provides that these states will not store or deploy nuclear weapons within those territories. Protocol II, which is open to adherence by nuclear-weapon states, provides that these states will not contribute to acts involving a violation of the treaty. The United States signed Protocol I in May 1977, and ratified it in November 1981. The United States signed Protocol II in April 1968, and ratified it in May 1971. This treaty and Additional Protocol I, in particular, have been the subject of a series of UN resolutions urging ratification by all concerned states.

On October 30 Mexico (and 18 cosponsors) tabled its traditional resolution in the First Committee concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The resolution recognized that there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits derived from the treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the four states that *de jure* or *de facto* are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties. It recalled that three of those states, United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States became parties to Additional Protocol I in 1969, 1971 and 1981, respectively. Deploring the fact that France has not yet ratified the protocol, the resolution once again urged France to do so without delay.

The First Committee approved Mexico's resolution on November 10 by a vote of 132 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 15 by a vote of 147 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 44/104.)

While supporting the Treaty of Tlatelolco and a party to its two protocols, the United States is of the view that the resolution should not focus exclusively on Protocol I but rather on the treaty itself. Accordingly, following the First Committee vote U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf explained that, while the United States joined consensus on the draft resolution, it did so with certain reservations:

> . . . At the same time, we wish to record as we have done numerous times in the past, our disappointment that this draft resolution focuses on Additional Protocol I of this Treaty and not on the issue of universal adherence to the Treaty by all eligible states.
>
> In doing so, this draft resolution is patently one-sided. It singles out one state for criticism, whereas it should call on the other eligible states in the region to become parties. Such a discriminatory draft resolution, which attacks only a part of the problem, loses much of its potential force and is less likely to achieve its intended purpose.
>
> As we have pointed previously, only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco, together with its protocols, is fully in force for all eligible states will it be able to make its full contribution to regional and international security. As we have done in previous years in respect of similar draft resolutions, we urge the sponsors of this draft resolution to alter their approach, should they decide in the future, to introduce a draft resolution on this treaty. Next year we should find it very difficult to associate ourselves with a similar draft resolution unless its text were to reflect our stated concerns.

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone

Since 1961 resolutions have been introduced in the First Committee calling for the designation of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and condemning South Africa for allegedly impeding this objective. In 1988 two resolutions were once again introduced in the First Committee concerning nuclear issues and Africa. The first resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa," was introduced by Kenya on October 30 on behalf of the OAU. The resolution "regretted" the inability of the UN Disarmament Commission to reach consensus on the question of South

Africa's nuclear capability and called upon all states to respect the continent and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It expressed "grave alarm at South Africa's possession and continued development of nuclear-weapon capability" and condemned it for these actions, while calling on states, corporations and individuals to refrain from actions which would frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa—i.e., keeping the continent free of nuclear weapons. The resolution demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and appealed "to all states that have the means to do so to monitor South Africa's research on and development and production of nuclear weapons and to publicize any information in that regard." Finally, it requested the Secretary General to assist the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The draft was amended on November 8, 10 and 14. In the First Committee vote November 16, it was approved by a vote of 129 to 0, with 4 abstentions (U.S.). The plenary adopted the resolution on December 15, by a vote of 147 to 0, with 4 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained on this resolution because, among other reasons, of its presumption that South Africa possesses a nuclear weapons capability. (Resolution 44/113 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa," also was introduced by Kenya on October 30. Its preamble expressed disappointment that "certain Western states and Israel" have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields and have "frustrated" Security Council efforts to "deal decisively" with the question through the use of the veto. The resolution condemned

> . . . all forms of nuclear collaboration by any state, corporation, institution or individual with the racist regime of South Africa, in particular the decision by some member states to grant licenses to several corporations in their territories to provide equipment and technical and maintenance services for nuclear installations in South Africa.

It took note of press reports that Israeli-South African collaboration had resulted in South African development of a nuclear-tipped missile and called for the Secretary General to investigate and report. It commended those governments which have taken measures to restrict cooperation with South Africa in nuclear and other fields. It demanded an end to exploitation of uranium resources in Namibia, requested the Disarmament Commission to consider South Africa's nuclear capability at its 1990 session, and demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 16 by a vote of 118 to 4 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The plenary adopted the resolution on December 15, by a vote of 137 to 4 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution, i.e., because of its allegation that "certain Western States and Israel" engage in military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. (Resolution 44/113 B.)

Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone

As it had done at previous General Assemblies, Egypt introduced a resolution on "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" in the First Committee on October 30. The resolution urged all parties concerned to take steps required to implement the proposal to make the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It called on those countries in the region that had not done so to place their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards and took note of the request made by the IAEA General Conference to its Director-General to "consult with the states concerned . . . to apply Agency safeguards to all nuclear installations in the area." It invited all countries in the region to declare their support for establishing such a zone, as well as to refrain from developing, testing or producing nuclear devices in territories under their control pending the establishment of a zone.

The United States has supported this resolution since it was first introduced in 1974. It was adopted without a vote by the First Committee on November 10 and by the General Assembly plenary on December 15. (Resolution 44/108.)

Following the Committee's action, U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf delivered the following explanation of the U.S. position on this resolution:

> The U.S. Delegation has joined in support of resolution L.9, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. With regard to preambular paragraph five, addressing the need for appropriate measures for the protection of nuclear facilities, the United States has not determined that additional measures are required. Moreover, nuclear facilities are already protected by the provisions of the UN Charter and the laws and customs of armed conflict, including those prohibiting attacks against facilities that are not legitimate military objectives and attacks that would cause disproportionate civilian casualties.

South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone

This traditional Pakistani resolution dates back to 1974. Pakistan's text in 1989, submitted on October 30 and cosponsored by Bangladesh, was along lines similar to those of previous years. It reaffirmed endorsement of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and urged the states of South Asia to continue efforts toward its establishment.

Additionally, the resolution requested states in the region to avoid actions contrary to this objective and called for the Secretary General to communicate with interested states to ascertain their views in order to further efforts to establish such a zone. It also requested the Secretary General to communicate with states in the region to determine their views in order to ascertain the best possibility of furthering efforts to establish such a zone.

The United States supported this resolution. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 102 (U.S.) to 3, with 30 abstentions and by the General Assembly on December 15 by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 3, with 32 abstentions. (Resolution 44/109.) In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative offered the following position on nuclear weapon-free zones in general and this resolution in particular:

> The U.S. Delegation has joined in support again this year of the traditional resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in South Asia, L.48. Our delegation is able to support the initiative because the proposal appears to be harmonious with the following criteria to which we subscribe: the initiative for a nuclear-weapon-free zone should arise from states in the region concerned; all states whose participation is deemed important should participate; there should be adequate verification provisions; the zone should not upset existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security; it should effectively prohibit nuclear explosive development or possession for any purpose; it should not restrain the exercise of such rights as freedom of navigation; and it should not affect the rights of states to make arrangements for such matters as port calls and transit privileges . . . .

He ended, however, with the following caveat:

> It is clear that there are other areas in which the conditions necessary for a nuclear weapon-free zone would not be satisfied, such as areas within the NATO region. Accordingly, our delegation wishes to note the reference in the preambular paragraph three to the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones in other regions of the world does not constitute for us an endorsement of such zones on a universal basis.

South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone

On October 30 Australia, New Zealand and three other South Pacific island states submitted a draft resolution entitled "South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty." The draft noted the adoption on August 6, 1985, of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Raratonga). Noting that the treaty entered into force on December 11, 1986, with the depositing of the eighth instrument of ratification, the draft noted with satisfaction that 11 members of the South Pacific Forum have now ratified the treaty and that China and the U.S.S.R. have adhered to Protocols 2 and 3 of the treaty. It also noted that the United States and United Kingdom have stated that none of their practices and activities within the treaty are inconsistent with the treaty or its protocols, and commended the treaty and its protocols to the consideration of all member states.

The draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 132 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). It was approved by a vote of 151 to 0, with 4 abstentions (U.S.) by the plenary on December 15. (Resolution 44/119 F.) The United States abstained because a favorable vote for the resolution, with its language commending the treaty to the consideration of all member states, would have been in contradiction to our decision not to adhere to the treaty or its protocols. That decision was taken in part because it was felt that the treaty provisions would compromise our deterrence policy.

INDIAN OCEAN ZONE OF PEACE

UN General Assembly resolution 2832 (1971), which contained a Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a "zone of peace," (IOZP) called for the great powers to remove their naval forces and facilities from the Indian Ocean. Subsequent annual resolutions endorsed the 1971 declaration and established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean* to consider its implementation. The United States has made clear from the beginning its reservations about the 1971 terms of reference for the deliberations concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In 1980, the United States, together with other Permanent Members of the Security Council and major maritime nations, accepted the invitation of littoral and hinterland states of the region to join the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Since that time, we have attempted to point out the anomaly of trying to restrict naval forces in the region while ignoring land-based forces, such as those of the Soviet Union that had long occupied Afghanistan, a hinterland state of the Indian Ocean. We also have consistently opposed the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean until there were indications that it could be successful. As long as there is no agreement on the basic principles that should govern an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the United States believes that such a conference would be premature.

In 1989 meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee were unable to produce a consensus recommendation for approval by the First Committee. Several members of the Western G–11 group proposed that Committee meetings be superceded by consultations conducted under the Chairman's authority, with the idea that these consultations would be a more productive way of making progress toward a consensus. However, the non-aligned rejected the idea and instead produced a draft resolution that the Western G–11 group found unacceptable because of its stipulation that a conference be held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, with its first stage in July 1990 even though there was no agreement as to what the conference was to discuss. The non-aligned also rejected a number of Western compromise proposals.

The draft resolution, presented by Yugoslavia on behalf of the non-aligned, was introduced by Sri Lanka on November 7. On November 29 a completely revised resolution was introduced based on the 1988 consensus resolution on the IOZP. (Resolution 43/79.) It called for a conference in 1991 in Colombo and for a 1-week and subsequent 2-week sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in 1990 to complete "remaining preparatory work." The resolution was adopted on November 30 by the First Committee and approved December 15 by the plenary by a vote of 137 to 4 (U.S., U.K., France, Japan) with 14 abstentions (other NATO countries, Israel). Before the First Committee vote was taken,

---

*Its 49 members in 1989 were Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen (Aden), Yemen (Sanaa), Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

best copy available

the U.S. Representative explained U.S. opposition to the resolution in the following terms:

> First, it continues to be based on the obsolete notion of great power confrontation in this age of increased great power cooperation in helping diffuse conflicts.
>
> Second, it continues the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee without any common conception as to what the committee is to accomplish . . . .
>
> It is time for those who have been pressing the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace issue to address the real problems of their region and not to invoke an obsolete concept that conveniently casts the blame for those problems on outsiders. The military presence of the United States in the Indian Ocean is not the cause of those problems.

Furthermore, he announced that the United States would not associate itself with the type of conference provided for in the draft resolution or with preparatory work for it (i.e., further meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee).

South Atlantic Zone of Peace

At the 41st General Assembly in 1986, Brazil and a number of African and Latin American cosponsors introduced for the first time a resolution in the Assembly plenary, without reference to a main Committee, calling for the delaration of a "Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic," to be established "in the region situated between Africa and South America." The text called upon all states, "in particular the militarily significant ones," to respect the zone, "especially through the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence there, the nonintroduction of nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the nonextension into the region of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it." The resolution also affirmed that the elimination of apartheid and the independence of Namibia were essential for peace and security in the South Atlantic region, and urged the implementation of all UN resolutions dealing with apartheid.

The South Atlantic resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. The United States opposed this resolution primarily because of its implication that restrictions should be placed on naval access to and activity in the South Atlantic Ocean. The United States regards such restrictions as inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation on the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters. At the 42nd General Assembly in 1987, a further resolution on the subject was passed which called on states to help implement the declaration and to refrain from any actions inconsistent with it.

At the 44th General Assembly, Brazil again took the lead in introducing in the General Assembly plenary a draft resolution on this subject. Largely procedural in nature, the text recalled the resolutions adopted in 1986, 1987 and 1988, noted efforts made by states to fulfill the goals of the declaration,

pages tightly bound

took note of the report submitted by the Secretary General, and called upon states to cooperate in promoting the objectives of the Zone and to refrain from actions inconsistent with them. It also welcomed the beginning of the implementation of the UN plan for Namibia in April 1989, emphasized the need to preserve the environment of the region, and urged all states to refrain from transferring and disposing hazardous, toxic and nuclear wastes into the region. Finally, it requested assistance from UN organs in carrying out seminars devoted to reviewing the developments and legal regime established by the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea, and asked the Secretary General to submit a report to the 45th General Assembly on the implementation of the declaration. On November 14 the plenary adopted the Brazilian resolution by a vote of 146 to 1 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. (Resolution 44/20.) U.S. opposition was based on the view that such a resolution would be inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation of the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters. In addition, the United States believed that any attempt to establish an internationally-recognized zone of peace would be made through multilateral negotiations among relevant parties rather than through a General Assembly resolution.

ISRAELI NUCLEAR ARMAMENT

As it had done in previous General Assemblies, Iraq on October 28 introduced a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Israeli nuclear armament," cosponsored by 19 Arab and Islamic states. Consistent with the text of previous years' resolutions on this subject, the resolution condemned Israel's refusal to renounce its alleged possession of nuclear weapons and requested the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure that Israel complied with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), and placed all of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It expressed concern over Israel's alleged "policy of attacking and destroying nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes" (preambular paragraph nine), and called on states and organizations to discontinue cooperation with Israel in the nuclear field (operative paragraph five). It also condemned purported nuclear cooperation between Israel and South Africa (operative paragraph two), and requested the IAEA "to suspend any scientific cooperation with Israel which could contribute to its nuclear capabilities" (operative paragraph six).

The United States objected to the overall thrust of this resolution, and especially its appeal to the IAEA to suspend nuclear cooperation with Israel. In the November 17 First Committee and December 15 plenary consideration of the resolution, separate votes were taken on five of its paragraphs. On preambular paragraph six, which recalled a resolution of the 1989 IAEA General Conference condemning Israeli refusal to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons and to submit its nuclear facilities to IAEA safeguards, the Assembly approved retaining the paragraph by a vote of 86 to 20 (U.S.), with

18 abstentions. Separate votes were also taken on preambular paragraph 10 (declaring that the "declared Israeli policy of attacking and destroying nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes is part of its nuclear armament policy"), which was retained by 73 to 22 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions; on operative paragraph 2 (reiterating its condemnation of "the cooperation between Israel and South Africa"), which was retained by 88 to 20 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions; on operative paragraph 6 (calling on states and organization which have not already done so to "discontinue cooperating with and giving any assistance to Israel in the nuclear field"), which was retained by 78 to 22 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions; and on operative paragraph 7 (reiterating its request to the IAEA to "suspend any cooperation with Israel which could contribute to its nuclear capabilities"), which was retained by a vote of 68 to 22 (U.S.), with 31 abstentions. In the plenary vote on December 15, results were as follows: resolution as a whole, 104 to 2 (U.S.), with 43 abstentions. (Resolution 44/121.)

VERIFICATION AND COMPLIANCE

The United States has long maintained that arms-control agreements are meaningless if signatories do not live up to the obligations that they have undertaken. The United States, therefore, has placed special emphasis on effective and appropriate verification and compliance provisions in arms-control agreements under negotiation and on ensuring that agreements in force are being complied with fully. The United States has sought to gain broad international acceptance of the importance of these concepts of verification and compliance in UN disarmament fora. On the other hand, the United States has generally believed that verification can best be arranged by parties to specific disarmament agreements and has doubted the usefulness or validity of establishing a general UN mechamism to observe compliance with agreements. We have regularly stated that any UN role in verifying compliance with a specific disarmament agreement must be developed and agreed upon by the parties negotiating the agreement.

On October 30, the United States, along with 33 other cosponsors, submitted a resolution on "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements," which followed up on a similar resolution it had presented the previous year. The resolution began by noting the importance of respecting the UN Charter, treaties and other sources of international law, taking note in particular "of the fundamental importance of full implementation and strict observance of agreements on arms limitation and disarmament if individual nations and the international community are to derive enhanced security from them." It stressed that violations of such agreements thus affected the security of states parties and others, and that the weakening of confidence in these agreements diminished their contribution to stability and further disarmament efforts and was therefore a matter of concern to the international community. The operative paragraphs of the U.S. resolution urged states "to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions" of arms limitation and disarmament agreements to which they were parties and called on all member states to give serious consideration to the implications of noncompliance. The resolution appealed to states to support efforts to resolve questions of noncompliance in order to maintain the integrity of arms control agreements and requested the Secretary General to assist member states in this regard. It welcomed efforts by states parties to develop additional cooperative measures to increase confidence in compliance with arms control and disarmament agreements and to reduce the possibility of misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Finally, it noted the contribution that verification experiments can make in confirming and perfecting verification procedures in arms limitation and disarmament agreements under negotiation.

On November 17 the Chairman stated that he had taken the initiative of preparing a new text, in which he had included some changes intended to reflect more appropriately the debate that had taken place in the Committee. As a result of that initiative, the United States agreed not to insist that the Committee take action on its original draft resolution (L.54). That day, the Chairman submitted, under the same subject, a "Draft resolution proposed by the Chairman" (L.67). The draft, which contained all the essential points in the original U.S. draft, L.54, was adopted without a vote the same day, and was approved by the plenary without a vote on December 15. (Resolution 44/122.)

PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE

At the 44th General Assembly, Egypt and Sri Lanka, on behalf of 15 non-aligned states, submitted the traditional non-aligned draft resolution on "Prevention of an arms race in outer space."

Drafted along lines similar to the corresponding text of the 1989 resolution 43/70, the Egyptian-Sri Lankan resolution once again requested the Conference on Disarmament to establish an *ad hoc* committee at its 1990 session "with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements . . . to prevent an arms race in outer space" (operative paragraph eight). Because of the controversial nature of the draft, a number of states requested votes on separate paragraphs. Preambular paragraph 11, which expressed "grave concern" at the "danger posed to all mankind by an arms race in outer space and, in particular, by developments that could further undermine international peace and security and retard the pursuit of general and complete disarmament," was approved by a vote of 119 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. Preambular paragraph 18, which recognized that U.S.-Soviet bilateral negotiations could facilitate multilateral negotiations for the prevention of an arms race in outer space in accordance with paragraph 27 of the final document of the 10th special session of the General Assembly, was approved by a vote of 117 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. Operative paragraph one, reaffirming that general and complete disarmament under effective international control warrants that outer space shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it shall not become an arena for an arms race, was approved by a vote of 119 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

Operative paragraph three, emphasizing that further measures with appropriate and effective provisions for verification to prevent an arms race in outer space should be adopted by the international community, was approved by the same vote. Operative paragraph eight, requesting the Conference on Disarmament to reestablish an *ad hoc* committee with an adequate mandate at the beginning of its 1990 session, with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements, as appropriate to prevent an arms race in outer space in all its aspects, was approved by a vote of 118 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was approved by the First Committee November 17 (the same date all paragraph votes were taken) by a vote of 132 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 15 by a vote of 153 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. Plenary votes on preambular paragraph 11, operative paragraphs 3 and 8 were 139 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. Preambular paragraph 18 was approved in the plenary by a vote of 137 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions, and operative paragraph 1 was approved by a vote of 136 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 44/112.)

U.S. Representative Robert Levine explained the U.S. vote in the following terms:

> There should be no doubt of the firm U.S. commitment to arms control in this area; the continuing bilateral nuclear and space talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are visible evidence of it. The United States would like nothing better than to be able to affirm this well-known commitment in this forum. Unfortunately, L. 10 does not permit us to do this. The text of L. 10 takes no notice of the more positive international climate that has developed from improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Indeed, by submitting virtually the same resolution this year as the one voted on in earlier years, despite the steadily improving international environment, this text is actually worse than the equivalent resolutions of earlier years. It bears less and less relationship to the realities of the international environment and simply becomes irrelevant—a collection of rhetoric to be ignored. It consists of a repository of exaggerated and hostile rhetoric with elements that are deliberately aimed at, and critical of, fundamental elements of U.S. policy.

ANTARCTICA

In resolution 38/77 of December 15, 1983, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a study on all aspects of Antarctica, taking into account the Antarctic Treaty system and other relevant factors. He was also to seek the views of member states and of those conducting scientific research in Antarctica, and to request assistance from other interested states and specialized agencies, as well as from organizations with scientific or technical information on Antarctica. The resulting report, which was submitted to the General Assembly in October 1984, reviewed a range of activities related to Antarctica without making any major recommendations. On December 17, 1984, General Assembly resolution 39/152 expressed appreciation to the Secretary General for the study, and placed Antarctica on the provisional agenda of the 40th session.

Consideration of Antarctica by the General Assembly at its 40th session led to a regrettable polarization of views on the issue, with a number of non-

Antarctic Treaty members pressing for fundamental changes in the Antarctic Treaty system, and treaty parties rejecting the alleged need for significant alterations in the system. Debate in the First Committee resulted in the adoption of three resolutions by vote for the first time, contrary to the previous consideration of Antarctica under the rule of consensus. Beyond these, Malaysia and other developing states also proposed the establishment of a UN *ad hoc* committee to consider Antarctic issues, but did not press for a vote on this issue.

Prior to the Antarctica votes at the 40th session, Australia announced on behalf of the United States and the other Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties that they viewed with regret the breaking of consensus which had formed the basis for past cooperation by the parties with nonmember states and with the United Nations. Since the Consultative Parties were not prepared to accept attempts to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system, the parties declared they would not participate in voting on Antarctica resolutions in either the First Committee or the General Assembly plenary until consensus, the only realistic basis for UN consideration of the matter, was restored. Australia further stated on behalf of the parties that they would suspend their cooperation with the United Nations on Antarctic matters until consensus was achieved again. This course of action continued in the 41st through the 44th sessions.

The solidarity of countries supporting the position articulated by Australia was maintained at the 1989 session, although some Antarctic Treaty countries supported the resolution that called for the exclusion of South Africa from the Antarctic Treaty, as described below.

Two resolutions on Antarctica were adopted by the 44th General Assembly. The first called upon the Consultative Parties to exclude South Africa from their meetings because of its policy of apartheid. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 22 by a vote of 94 to 0, with 6 abstentions and 34 (U.S.) not participating. It was approved by the plenary on December 15 by a vote of 114 to 0 with 7 abstentions and 31 (U.S.) not participating. (Resolution 44/124 A.)

The second resolution expressed the conviction that any minerals regime in Antarctica should be negotiated with the "full participation of all members of the international community" (and not just of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties themselves). In addition, it reiterated the call upon the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary General or his representatives to meetings, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report of his evaluations of these meetings at the 45th General Assemtly. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 22 by a vote of 85 to 0, with 7 abstentions and 42 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 15 by a vote of 101 to 0, with 6 abstentions and 44 states (U.S.) not participating. (Resolution 44/124 B.)

Prior to the November 22 vote on resolution 44/124 B in the First Committee, Australia, speaking on behalf of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative and Non-

Consultative Parties, expressed the parties' misgivings about the value of debates in the United Nations on the Antarctic Treaty system. Australia rejected criticisms of the treaty and highlighted the accomplishments of the treaty system. The parties found it unfortunate and regrettable that the General Assembly's consideration of Antarctica had departed from the pattern of consensus in recent years. Australia concluded by stating that the Treaty Parties remain willing to display flexibility and to negotiate a return to consensus in the UN's consideration of Antarctica, but not at what the Treaty Parties regard as the cost of the possible erosion of the successful functioning of the Antarctic Treaty system.

OUTER SPACE

UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

The 53-member UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and its Legal Subcommittee all met during 1989. For several decades after its inception in 1958, the Committee worked successfully in the exchange of scientific information and negotiated four widely accepted conventions that form the basis of international space law. However, the scientific and legal work of the Committee has deteriorated seriously in recent years with debates becoming increasingly political. There has been a tendency to try to involve the Committee in disarmament and other matters that the United States and other Western states believe are fundamentally at odds with the Committee's mandate and with the consensus procedure that governs its work.

The 32nd session of COPUOS took place in June, and the West continued to call for the adoption of measures to make the work of COPUOS and its subcommittees more relevant to the present state of space exploration for the benefit of all countries. Western proposals along these lines continued to be opposed by the East, which chose instead to introduce extraneous political issues. At the June 1989 session, member states exchanged views on an item concerning the secondary application of space technology for addressing problems on earth. This topic was first proposed by the United States at the 31st session of COPUOS. On the basis of a Joint Resolution of Congress in 1986, which was endorsed by President Reagan, international scientific organizations and national space agencies will celebrate 1992 as the International Space Year. Member states agreed that, based on U.S. ideas, COPUOS could play a meaningful role in the International Space Year without any impact on the regular budget of the United Nations through the training and education capabilities of the UN Program on Space Applications.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

In February the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee considered a full agenda of topics dealing with a wide range of questions on the use and exploration of outer space, including space science, astronomy, planetary exploration, practical applications of remote sensing and satellite communications technology and the use of nuclear power sources in space. The subcommittee paid particular attention to the use of space technology for combating environmental problems, and decided to focus in 1990 on the use of space technology for terrestrial search and rescue and disaster relief activities. Western delegations supplemented the formal discussions with special presentations by eminent researchers in these areas. These measures have proven to be useful toward strengthening the scientific content of the subcommittee's work, facilitating contacts among space scientists and keeping member states abreast of knowledge gained in space exploration.

LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE

The 28th session of the Legal Subcommittee was convened in March. The agenda included the definition and delimitation of outer space, the rational and equitable use of the geostationary orbit and principles governing the use of nuclear power sources in space. The subcommittee considered for the first time a new agenda item on dealing with the application of the principle that space exploration should be carried out for the benefit of all countries, taking into particular account the needs of developing countries. The United States achieved a certain level of success in the debate on nuclear power source principles by insisting on provisions for the safe use of nuclear power in space which reflect current U.S. policy and practice. These proposals received broad support from Western and G–77 delegations. However, the East demurred. The United States and seven other Western countries introduced a comprehensive plan to revamp the subcommittee's organization of work with the view to redressing that body's perennial underutilization of conference resources. The proposal was dismissed by the East, which continued to resist any efforts to improve the working methods of the subcommittee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The 44th General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, adopted without a vote an omnibus resolution dealing with "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space." (Resolution 44/46.) The resolution, as previous resolutions on the same item have done each year, renews COPUOS and sets the agenda for the Committee and its subcomittees. Of particular note was the General Assembly's decision to endorse the efforts of international scientific organizations to designate 1992 as International Space Year.

Thomas Snook, U.S. Representative to the Special Political Committee, outlined U.S. views on the work of COPUOS as follows:

> . . . we believe the results of the 32nd session held in June were generally positive. For the first time, the Committee initiated an important new discussion concerning current developments on spin-offs from outer space programs . . . .

> We also welcome the Committee's recommendation that the General Assembly endorse the initiative of international scientific organizations to designate 1992 as International Space Year (ISY). In this respect, the Committee further recommended that the training and educational capabilities of the UN Space Application Program should be utilized to provide a useful role for the United Nations in ISY, and that this role should be established through voluntary contributions and without any impact on the regular budget. . . . This approach, which avoids a declaration of the Year by the General Assembly, wisely, defers to the international scientific community for organizing relevant programs and activities. This is the same approach followed in the highly successful International Geophysical Year. Moreover, as most delegations are aware, the United States has already come forward with a detailed offer of voluntary assistance in respect to the role of the Space Applications Program in ISY.
>
> . . . the results of the recent COPUOS session were not uniformly successful. This was certainly true in the failure to reach consensus on arrangements for the next session of the Legal Subcommittee. In our opinion, the traditional 3-week duration and schedule of work of the Legal Subcommittee do not provide a suitable basis for its next session . . . .
>
> . . . I would like to conclude by reiterating our willingness and readiness to work with all delegations interested in making COPUOS and its two subcommittees function as effectively and as efficiently as possible. COPUOS, as the only standing committee of the General Assembly having an exclusive mandate for promoting international cooperation in the use and exploration of outer space, occupies a unique position within the United Nations. At the same time it is clear that its mandate does not include questions related to disarmament which fall within the competence of other UN bodies.

LAW OF THE SEA

The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (LOS) was convened in 1972 and completed negotiations on an LOS Treaty at its 11th and final session in the spring of 1982.

In 1982, after a searching review of the draft treaty and of U.S. participation in the LOS negotiations, the United States decided to participate in the final round of negotiations and attempt to protect U.S. interests by seeking amendments to the seabed-mining section of the draft convention, which the United States believed to be fundamentally flawed. The United States was unable to obtain essential changes and therefore called for a vote on the treaty. The vote was 130 to 4 (U.S., Turkey, Israel and Venezuela), with 17 abstentions (principally a combination of EC countries and the Eastern European countries). President Reagan subsequently announced on July 19, 1982, that the United States would not sign the treaty, and was later joined in this view by two other major seabed-mining nations—the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The General Assembly adopted resolutions at its 37th through 43rd sessions that welcomed the adoption of the LOS Convention, called on all states to sign and ratify the convention, and approved financing of the LOS Preparatory Commission from the regular UN budget. Only the United States and Turkey opposed the resolutions.

The 1989 Law of the Sea resolution contained a number of additions, deletions, and changes which reflect a widespread effort to move in the direction of meeting U.S. concerns. The deletions removed language suggesting U.S. conduct is unlawful or otherwise unacceptable. Additions to the language stressed the importance of universal participation in the Law of the Sea Convention, which in context was intended to reflect positive non-aligned recognition in the Preparatory Commission and elsewhere of the need to meet U.S. objections. On November 20 the 44th General Assembly again endorsed the LOS Convention and approved funds for the Preparatory Commission from the regular UN budget by a vote of 135 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 44/26.)

The U.S. statement, delivered by U.S. Permanent Representative Thomas R. Pickering on November 20, was a positive response to the improved resolution and the growing willingness of others to rethink their stance on deep seabed mining:

> The United States views the 1982 UN Convention of the Law of the Sea as a major accomplishment in the development of international law of the oceans. The convention has many positive aspects and the United States has actively supported and promoted observance of the vast majority of its provisions.
>
> Unfortunately, the convention also contains provisions on deep seabed mining that are fundamentally unacceptable to the United States. Our concerns were clearly stated in 1982 when we announced our decision not to sign the convention. We have followed closely developments regarding seabed mining since 1982 and we are aware that there has been an evolution in thinking of some other governments. We are encouraged by the recognition by many states that a reevaluation of the seabed regime is necessary. We have noted with interest the recent statement of the Chairman of the G-77 expressing willingness for a dialogue and the group's support for efficiency and cost effectiveness of the seabed regime.
>
> The resolution removes thinly veiled criticisms of the United States contained in earlier resolutions, welcomes the willingness of states to explore all possibilities of addressing outstanding issues and invites states to renew efforts to facilitate universal participation in the convention.
>
> We view these changes as positive developments. They suggest that there is a growing awareness of the need to address the concerns of the United States and other industrial states involved in deep seabed mining.
>
> The United States shares the desire for a universally acceptable convention. However, we are concerned that, notwithstanding what appears to be a genuine desire for dialogue, many countries do not understand that, from the U.S. perspective, the seabed regime remains seriously flawed . . . .
>
> Notwithstanding the improvements, the United States continues to object to certain aspects of the resolution. In particular, we cannot join in the call for all states to consider early ratification or accession to the convention to allow entry into force of the seabed regime when we object to that regime. In addition, we continue to object to the funding of the Preparatory Commission from the general budget of the United Nations and believe it should be funded by those states participating therein. For these reasons, regretfully, we must oppose the resolution.
>
> Having expressed our concerns regarding the seabed regime, I would like to express my Government's support for the emphasis placed on efforts to encourage states to bring their national laws into conformity with international law, as reflected in the provisions of the convention concerning traditional uses of the oceans. My Government has been active in supporting and promoting compliance with these provisions and discouraging claims that are inconsistent with international law. In particular, we welcome the action by many

states to revise their laws and regulations to ensure conformity with international law and encourage others to do likewise.

I would also like to take this opportunity to point out that the United States does not view the call upon all states to safeguard the unity of the convention as a limitation on either the right or duty of all states to act in accordance with those portions of the convention which reflect customary international law.

GENERAL POLITICAL PROBLEMS

Membership

There were no new applications for UN membership in 1989.

Question of Peacekeeping

PEACEKEEPING COMMITTEE

In 1965 the General Assembly established the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Peacekeeping Committee) to attempt to overcome financial difficulties caused by unpaid peacekeeping assessments and to examine all aspects of future peacekeeping operations. Ever since then, the Peacekeeping Committee has been responsible for carrying out a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations on conceptual and practical levels. The Committee's membership was increased from 33 to 34 in December 1988.*

The Peacekeeping Committee met four times in 1989: April 10, 11, 12 and June 1. The Committee created an open-ended working group to discuss matters before the Committee. The working group met 10 times from April 17 through May 31. The Committee forwarded to the General Assembly a series of recommendations based on these discussions in the form of a draft resolution. The recommendations included inviting member states to identify forces they would be willing, in principle, to contribute to peacekeeping operations in order to form a registry of potential contributions; studying possible tasks that could be undertaken by civilian personnel; encouraging states to exchange information on peacekeeping experiences and to form national peacekeeping training programs; urging the payment of assessments on time; urging host countries to extend support to the deployment of peacekeepers; urging the conclusion of status of forces agreements between host countries and the United Nations; preparation of a model status of forces agreement; and updating the UN publication *The Blue Helmets*.

---

*Members in 1989 were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly's Special Political Committee considered the question of peacekeeping in four meetings October 30–November 2.

On November 2 U.S. Ambassador Alexander Watson told the Special Political Committee that important changes had taken place in the world, and that issues which had preoccupied the Peacekeeping Committee's operations had disappeared. Efforts must be made to build upon the broadened consensus in support of peacekeeping, particularly by resolving regional conflicts.

The Peacekeeping Committee had issued a set of carefully considered recommendations which formed the basis for measured optimism. Ideas for strengthening peacekeeping activities should be considered first in the Committee, which should continue its measured and constructive approach. The Committee should not be distracted by issues such as preventive diplomacy, which are dealt with elsewhere.

The Special Political Committee adopted a draft resolution November 2 sponsored by the members of the Bureau of the Peacekeeping Committee (Argentina, Canada, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Japan and Nigeria) by consensus. (Draft Resolution A/SPC/44/L.6 and Corr. 1.) The resolution replicated the recommendations of the draft resolution forwarded by the Peacekeeping Committee with one minor change. On December 8 the General Assembly adopted the draft without a vote. (Resolution 44/49).

Efforts Toward Strengthening the Role of the United Nations

CHARTER COMMITTEE

The Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (Charter Committee) held its 14th session in New York, March 27–April 14. The 47-member committee was established by the UN General Assembly in 1975 and has convened annually since 1976. The Committee considers a wide variety of proposals under three general headings: (1) maintenance of peace and security (MPS); (2) peaceful settlement of disputes (PSD); and (3) rationalization of UN procedures.

The Committee considered two working papers on factfinding by the United Nations relating to MPS, one proposed by a WEOG group, the other by Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. The Committee decided to consider revisions of these documents at future meetings. Under the PSD heading, the Committee completed consideration of the Romanian proposal on the resort to a commission of good offices, mediation or conciliation and agreed by consensus to forward a draft decision to the

General Assembly which would contain suggested possible means to resolve disputes between states.

The Committee forwarded a report of its work to the 44th General Assembly via the Sixth Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Sixth Committee considered the report of the Charter Committee at nine meetings, held over a period of time from September 29 to November 21.

The Committee also considered the item "Peaceful settlement of disputes between States" in conjunction with the report of the Charter Committee, in accordance with resolution 43/163 of the previous General Assembly.

In the course of his statement to the Sixth Committee on October 9, U.S. Representative Robert B. Rosenstock indicated that

> Another important area to which the Charter Committee is well equipped to make significant contributions is that of rationalization of the work of the United Nations. Over the years, the Charter Committee has made significant recommendations in this area which have found their way into the practice of the Assembly. More work is needed and it needs to be undertaken in an open minded spirit consistent with current realities.

On November 21 Egypt introduced a draft resolution, Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, sponsored by 26 states that was adopted without a vote. On December 4 the General Assembly also adopted the resolution, without a vote. (Resolution 44/37.) The resolution established priorities for the Charter Committee's work in 1990: (1) the question of maintenance of international peace and security, and within that context, consideration of the question of factfinding activities by the United Nations; and (2) continuation of its work on the question of peaceful settlement of disputes between states. The resolution also requests the Secretary General to continue, on a priority basis, the preparation of the draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes between states.

Also, on November 21, the Sixth Committee adopted without a vote a draft decision, titled "Resort to a Commission of good offices, mediation or conciliation within the United Nations." The decision was adopted without a vote in plenary on December 4. (Decision 44/415.)

The General Assembly on December 4, adopted resolution 44/31, which, *inter alia*: (1) urged states to observe and promote in good faith the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes in the settlement of their disputes; (2) called upon states to make full use of the UN framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes and international problems;

and (3) requested the Secretary General to submit to the General Assembly at its next session a report containing "the replies of member states, relevant UN bodies and specialized agencies, regional intergovernmental organizations and interested international legal bodies on the implementation of the Manila Declaration and on ways and means of increasing the effectiveness of this document." The resolution was adopted by plenary by a vote of 131 to 0, with 21 abstentions (U.S.). The United States and WEOG abstained because amendments to the Romanian draft resolution tabled by the Nordics and the EC were not adopted. These amendments would have removed the operative request to the Secretary General to report on the implementation of the Manila Declaration; and would have changed the decision to consider the question of peaceful settlement of disputes as a separate agenda item.

Questions Relating to Information

Questions relating to information are discussed at annual sessions of the UN Committee on Information (COI). The COI is a standing committee of the General Assembly mandated to oversee UN public information activities, including those of the UN Department of Public Information (DPI), and to coordinate information activities of UN specialized agencies. It had 73 members during 1989. Each year it adopts a set of recommendations on information issues to submit to the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly, which, after discussion, adopts the recommendations in their original or amended form as a resolution.

The Group of 77 (G-77) enjoys an overwhelming numerical preponderance in COI membership, and has succeeded in establishing its agenda, views and language as the basis for discussion within the Committee. Some of the most active G-77 countries have been those which are least democratic, and the language of the COI recommendations has therefore frequently reflected views inimical to the principles of free flow of information and freedom of the press. In the past, these countries usually enjoyed the support of the Eastern Europeans in advancing their views. We and our allies have succeeded, however, in gradually moderating this language to reflect Western views on free flow of information and freedom of the press, as incorporated in the UN Charter. We have also succeeded in introducing language calling for greater objectivity in DPI reporting and for more efficient management of DPI. Improvements in the resolutions have not yet been sufficient, however, to gain U.S. or general Western support.

During the COI's 11th session, held April 13-28, the COI failed, as in 1988, to agree on a set of recommendations. No vote was taken. As a result, the COI's report to the SPC included only an account of its general debate. The draft recommendations introduced in two papers—one on the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) and another on guidance for the DPI—presented by the COI Chairman, and revised during discussions at the session, were not formally annexed to the report because of G-77 objections. However, a statement appeared in the report recommending that the Chairman's papers be included in the Special Political Committee's consideration of the information issue.

At the Special Political Committee's session, held November 5–23, the two papers prepared by the COI Chairman served as the initial basis of negotiations on a draft resolution. It was agreed among the various spokespersons of the regional groups to begin negotiations with the second, less controversial, paper on guidance for the DPI. Within the G–77 there was very little argument and hardliners who called for a return to last year's draft were put down easily by moderates, who have become progressively stronger. However, within the Western Group solidarity broke down over a political issue. The Greek and Turkish Representatives took opposing views on the mention of Cyprus in a list of conflicts in that the United Nations is involved. This caused an impasse which led to a breakdown in negotiations with the G–77. Malaysia, on behalf of the G–77, forced through a resolution combining the two papers which was made palatable to some Western countries by the liberal infusion of language from a recently adopted UNESCO resolution on communications.

Among the positive points in this year's deliberations on information were that the drafters kept the resolution in two parts, thereby separating the broader information question from instructions to the DPI. Much objectionable G–77 language was removed, including the once non-negotiable phrase, "the principle of sovereign equality extends also to this field." Furthermore, language referring to freedom of the press and the independence of the media is prominent in the text as are references to private as well as public media.

However, despite concessions and improvements, unacceptable language remains in the text including formulations which make references to freedom of the press somewhat ambiguous. For this reason, the United States felt compelled once again to vote against the resolution. In an explanation of vote, U.S. Ambassador Alexander Watson said that while the United States is willing to support a realistic resolution, the call for the establishment of a new world information and communication order (NWICO), no matter how we define it, has, over the years, taken on connotations which we believe can be used to oppose freedom of speech and freedom of the press. He added that the United States had strong objections to instructions to the DPI asking it to continue to cover UN Middle East activities in accordance with UN resolutions which we voted against in the past. He also objected to the call to the Secretary General to assure equitable geographical distribution of DPI posts since the UN Charter calls for this principle to be Secretariat-wide rather than Department-specific.

The draft resolution on Questions Relating to Information was approved in the final session of the Special Political Committee on November 23 (107 to 2

(U.S.) with 20 abstentions). In contrast to the situation last year (100 to 8 (U.S.) with 15 abstentions), the United States stood alone with Israel in opposition. Two Western countries, Austria and Sweden voted for the resolution. The EC–12 abstained as a group on procedural grounds along with Canada, Japan, Iceland, Norway, Finland, Australia, New Zealand and Turkey.

This voting shift within the Western Group reflected general approval, among the EC–12 and other countries, for the language supportive of free expression incorporated in the resolution from the communications resolution of the just-concluded UNESCO General Conference.

In the General Assembly plenary session on December 8, the information resolution was adopted by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 44/50.)

Nepal was admitted to membership in the COI, bringing the total number to 73.

The United States has long been critical of the lack of objectivity in the materials DPI disseminates. In April 1986 the General Accounting Office (GAO), responding to a request by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), published a report evaluating DPI printed materials and scripts of its radio programs. The report (GAO/NSIAD-86-98) showed that about half of the products opposed key U.S. interests. It recommended that the Secretary of State develop a review process to better monitor selected UN public information materials. The Department of State initiated review procedures in August 1986 at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in New York and instructed all U.S. Embassies in countries where UN Information Centers are located to review the materials the Centers disseminate. These procedures have made DPI more aware of U.S. concerns and more attentive to objectivity and fairness in relation to U.S. interests. The number of occasions upon which the United States is finding it necessary to register concern is decreasing, and the extent and depth of anti-U.S. bias has diminished somewhat. The appointment of a Canadian director of DPI in March 1987, the reorganization she is implementing, and the personnel changes she has made have produced a greater willingness to listen to and to heed U.S. complaints and suggestions. These developments give cause for optimism that a further reduction in anti-U.S. bias is possible. The monitoring efforts are continuing.

Part 2

Economic, Social, Scientific and Human Rights Affairs

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III of the UN Charter established the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) as the principal organs of the United Nations responsible for the issues covered in Part 2 of this report. ECOSOC's limited membership (54 countries), however, has led the developing countries to prefer the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies where they enjoy maximum voting strength for substantive discussion and action on international economic development issues. As a result, the General Assembly has created entities (described in this part) for substantive discussion and action on international economic development issues. The most important of these is the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies constitute the major fora for what has been called the North/South dialogue between developed and developing countries. The North/South distinction, however, tends to mask the significant differences within each group and to overlook the high degree of economic interdependence which exists between developed and developing countries and among developing countries themselves. The major fora for North/South economic dialogue in 1990 are the UN Special Session Devoted to International Economic Cooperation, meetings to prepare an International Development Strategy (IDS) for the 1990s, and the Second UN Conference on Least Developed Countries, which are discussed under their own headings in this part.

The General Assembly, in its regular sessions, is organized into seven committees. The Second Committee is responsible primarily for economic affairs, and the Third Committee for cultural, humanitarian and social affairs.

The Second and Third Committees receive some of their issues directly, but most are passed to them by ECOSOC. All elements of the UN system primarily concerned with the issues in this section usually report to the General Assembly through ECOSOC. It is authorized only to comment on reports from other bodies before conveying them to the General Assembly.

ECOSOC consists of its plenary body; five regional economic commissions, several functional commissions; and a varying number of subcommissions, working groups and expert groups. The regional economic commissions and many of the other bodies are covered later in this part.

In 1989 some of the major issues before the Second Committee were the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development, the impact of driftnet fishing on marine life, the international debt crisis, preparations for the Special Session Devoted to International Economic Cooperation, operational activities for development and the eradication of poverty. Other important issues included the Nicaragua Trade Embargo, preparations for the new International Development Strategy, and traffic in hazardous wastes.

The United States and 17 cosponsors were able to negotiate a consensus resolution on internationally endorsed measures, including possible moratoria, to control and mitigate large-scale, high seas driftnet fishing. The resolution notes the potentially irreversible damage that large-scale driftnet fishing can have on the marine environment and provides a format within which concerned members of the international community can take effective conservation and management measures to limit the impact of driftnet fishing.

The debt issue was given high priority by the Group of 77 (G-77) again this year. Despite long and arduous negotiations, the United States was again unable to accept a modified G-77 resolution on this issue because the resolution did not recognize or support progress being made under the strengthened debt strategy. Nor did the resolution sufficiently acknowledge the primary role of the IMF and World Bank in implementing the strengthened strategy. In addition, the resolution gave too little emphasis to the need for domestic reforms in the developing countries. The final vote on the resolution was 139 in favor, 1 against (U.S.) and no abstentions.

Constructive engagement by the United States on development issues dealing with the environment resulted in the adoption of a number of resolutions acceptable to the United States. Included among these was a resolution convening a 2-week Environmental Conference in June 1992.

A comprehensive resolution on operational activities for development was adopted by consensus following lengthy negotiations between donor countries and the G-77. The resolution calls for greater utilization and strengthening of national capacities for the programming and implementation of operational activities; more effective UN system support for such capacity building; further decentralization of UN system support activities from UNDP and specialized agency headquarters to the country level, including the redeployment of staff; and a more integrated approach to the programming and management of operational activities at the country level.

The United States was again faced with a resolution deploring the U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua. The United States maintained its position that the Second Committee was not the appropriate forum for an issue which was basically political. Despite the U.S. stand, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 82 to 2 (U.S.), with 47 abstentions, a slight improvement over 1988.

The Third Committee considered questions on racism, refugees, migrant workers, self-determination, totalitarianism, rights of the child, aging, women, the family, crime, narcotics, religious intolerance, torture and other human rights issues. Resolutions were adopted on the human rights situations in Afghanistan, Chile, Iran and El Salvador. For the first time, the Iranian Government issued a formal invitation to the UN's human rights rapporteur to visit Iran. A resolution calling for the ECOSOC to expand the membership of the Human Rights Commission was adopted over strong U.S. objections.

ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The Critical Economic Situation in Africa

In May 1986, the General Assembly, at the request of the African Group, convened a special session (the 13th special session of the General Assembly) on "The Critical Economic Situation in Africa" at its headquarters in New York. The special session issued a declaration in which the Africans affirmed their commitment to economic reform and the international community gave a political commitment to support their efforts. The declaration's language on major financial and assistance issues closely paralleled stated U.S. policy. The special session also adopted resolution S-13/2 by consensus which contained the UN Program of Action for Economic Recovery and Development 1986–1990 for Africa.

On October 6 the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board adopted a balanced resolution on the Program of Action emphasizing the mutual commitment and cooperation between the African countries and the international community in implementation of the Program of Action and appealing for more assistance from the international donor community. Speaking on behalf of the Western countries, the U.S. Delegate said that all countries could not help but be impressed with African desires to achieve sustainable development and the need to help African countries help themselves to attain this goal. He noted that Africa's economic problems were serious but solvable through a mixture of economic reforms relying on realistic, well-defined, and long-term structural adjustment programs, increased concessional financing and grant assistance, and national and international policies that stimulate trade and increase foreign investment. The U.S. Delegate went on to say that it was evident that over the last year, multilateral agencies and bilateral donors had accelerated their assistance to African countries. In addition, following the Paris and Toronto Summit communiques, debt and debt service relief also increased at a rapid pace.

On November 17 the General Assembly adopted decision 44/411 by consensus calling for activities in support of the Program of Action to continue pending the final review and appraisal of the Program of Action to take place at the 46th UN General Assembly.

Emergency Assistance to Somalia, Sudan and Countries Affected by Hurricane Hugo

Each year, the UN General Assembly typically adopts a number of resolutions calling on member states and UN agencies to assist by whatever means possible those countries afflicted by natural disasters and political upheaval. At its 44th session, the UN General Assembly adopted three such resolutions calling for emergency assistance to Somalia, Sudan and those countries affected by Hurricane Hugo. The United States joined consensus in the adoption of these resolutions. (Resolution 44/178, Decision 44/447 and Resolution 44/3.)

The three resolutions urge all member states to contribute to the relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts in the affected areas and request the United Nations and all of its agencies, as well as the international financial institutions, to assist those countries in mobilizing the additional financial resources necessary for their rehabilitation and reconstruction. These resolutions have no financial implications for the regular UN budget.

International Assistance for the Economic Rehabilitation of Angola

The General Assembly agreed December 7 to a request by Angola to include an item on its agenda on international assistance for that country's economic rehabilitation. According to the Angolan Delegation, the country had suffered many casualities and great material damage from "direct and constant aggression by South Africa" since its independence. The Angolans called on the international community to express its solidarity with the Angolan people by providing "appropriate financial, material and technical assistance . . . necessary for the economic rehabilitation of Angola."

A resolution (44/168) on this issue was adopted by the General Assembly on December 15. The final vote on the resolution was 150 in favor, none against and 2 abstentions (U.S. and Israel).

Although the United States shares the concern of the international community over the human suffering and destruction wrought by the civil war in Angola, it abstained on the resolution because it incorrectly implied that this suffering and destruction derived solely from acts of aggression from South Africa.

International Development Strategy

The International Development Strategy (IDS) for the 1980s was adopted by consensus in 1980 at the 35th session of the UN General Assembly and was intended to provide a blueprint for international economic growth throughout the decade. Although the IDS endorsed many development principles advocated by the United States, it also had significant weaknesses—including overly ambitious and unrealistic growth targets for developing countries in the 1980s, and excessive dependence on official development assistance for meeting its goals by calling for donor countries to reach an assistance target of 0.7 percent of GNP. Because of these weaknesses, the United States made a statement of reservation at the time of the adoption of the IDS.

On December 20, 1988, the 43rd General Assembly approved a G–77- sponsored resolution establishing an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole for the preparation of a new International Development Strategy for the Fourth Development Decade (1990s). The vote on resolution 43/182 was 151 to 0 with 1 abstention (U.S). In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative noted that while the United States had supported the three previous international development strategies, it had serious reservations about their approach and unrealistic goals and targets. He reiterated U.S. objections to the 0.7 percent target of official development assistance, characterizing it as arbitrary and impractical. The United States believes that development strategies must be developed on a case-by-case basis, according to each country's specific needs and situation, he said.

The *Ad Hoc* Committee, including the United States, met in organizational session in New York, March 15–17, and approved a timetable of meetings for preparation of the strategy. At the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, held June 5–9, there was broad agreement that the new strategy should be more realistic, concise and practical than its predecessors. At the second session, held September 11–15, the *Ad Hoc* Committee identified elements of a broad outline of the structure of the strategy, i.e., accelerating economic growth in developing countries, alleviation of poverty, human resources development and the need for follow up on implementation of the strategy.

On December 19 the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 44/169 recommending a general outline to serve as the basis for future negotiation of the strategy. The United States supported the resolution, in part, because the outline recommended that the strategy focus on the national efforts of the developing countries as well as the efforts of the international donor community and emphasized the need to take account of the diverse situations, requirements and problems of developing countries.

Long-Term Trends in Economic Development

The General Assembly first showed an interest in long-term trends and forecasts at its 30th session in 1975. Stating that an examination of long-term trends in the economic development of individual regions was of great importance for securing a rapid rate of economic development of all countries, in particular of developing countries, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a comprehensive report on long-term trends and forecasts in the economic development of the various regions and their mutual relationship. At its 32nd session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare an overall socioeconomic perspective of the development of the world economy up to the year 2000. This report was 5 years in preparation and when it appeared in 1982, the United States found it to be unduly pessimistic, biased toward blaming international factors rather than domestic policies for the economic problems of developing countries, while paying insufficient attention to the role of the private sector in development. Nevertheless, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare another comprehensive report for submission in 1985 and wanted to institutionalize the preparation of revised and updated reports every 3 years. The United States opposed this idea, largely because we feel that such reports are better handled by the IMF and the World Bank which possess greater economic expertise than the UN Secretariat.

At its 40th session in 1985 the General Assembly took note of the Secretary General's latest report on the overall socioeconomic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000, and charged him with revising and updating it in time for the 42nd session in 1987—2 years later. The United States opposed the resolution because it contained unacceptable references to the New International Economic Order (NIEO) and to the relationship between disarmament and development. The vote was 144 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

At the resumed 40th session of the General Assembly to consider the financial crisis facing the United Nations, the General Assembly decided to postpone consideration of the Secretary General's report until the 43rd session of the Assembly.

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, the United States again questioned the utility and relevance of this report. The United States ultimately joined consensus in adopting a resolution which gives the Secretary General greater flexibility in selecting the focus of the report and extends the interval of updates to every 5 years.

There was no resolution pertaining to this issue in the 44th UN General Assembly.

Economic Commission for Europe

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), established in 1947, is one of five regional economic commissions which report to ECOSOC. It has 34 members—the 32 European members plus Canada and the United States.

Other UN member countries take part, in a consultative capacity, when matters of particular concern to them are considered. Composed largely of developed nations, the ECE focuses on problems confronting modern industrialized societies. Decisions are made by consensus reached in deliberations between Eastern and Western caucuses.

The ECE's terms of reference are broad, and over the years the nature of its work has paralleled changing European and Atlantic concerns. When first established, the ECE's principal focus was on European post-war economic reconstruction. Since then, the Commission has evolved into a forum where East and West can consult on economic and technical problems of common interest. Areas of particular interest to the United States are the Commission's work on statistics, the environment, harmonization of standards, electronic trade and transport data interchange and transport of dangerous goods.

The final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) specifically accorded the ECE a number of responsibilities for multilateral activity in economics, transportation, science, technology and the environment. The concluding document of the followup meeting of representatives of the participating states of the CSCE signed in Madrid in 1983 reaffirmed the ECE's role as a forum for implementing CSCE "Basket II" provisions relating to energy, trade, air pollution and transport.

The ECE carries out its activities principally through specialized committees and subsidiary bodies. These include committees on agricultural problems; the chemical industry; coal; electric power; gas; housing, building and planning; inland transport; steel; timber; and the development of trade. Subsidiary bodies include the Conference of European Statisticians, Senior Advisors on Environmental and Water Problems, Senior Advisors on Science and Technology, Senior Economic Advisors, Government Officials Responsible for Standardization Policies, and the Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation. Additional subjects of interest to the Commission are dealt with by *ad hoc* groups, notably the Senior Advisors on Energy. A large number of U.S. Government departments and agencies, as well as congressional and private sector representatives, actively participate in ECE-sponsored meetings.

The Commission held its 44th session on April 12–21 in Geneva, against a backdrop of improved overall East-West economic cooperation. One resolution of particular interest to the United States charged the annual sessional committee meeting with reviewing the ECE's medium-term plan and program budget to improve member governments' understanding of the relationship between the Commission's program and budget. Other resolutions called upon members to become parties to the Protocol on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions; requested member states to exchange environmental technologies on a commercial basis; invited other regional commissions to cooperate in the promotion of the UN Rules for Electronic

Data Interchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport; requested governments to promote standardization; and called upon the Commission's subsidiary bodies to actively promote sustainable development.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was established in 1947. The United States was one of the original 10 members. At present, there are 38 members and 10 associate members. Five members (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States) are from outside the region, which covers an extensive area from Mongolia south to New Zealand, and from Iran east to the island nations in the Pacific. ESCAP's headquarters are in Bangkok, although some subsidiary bodies and other activities are located in other Asian cities.

ESCAP's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the area of social and economic development, providing a forum for debate on development issues, providing technical assistance and advisory services, and helping members attract outside assistance. ESCAP does not itself provide capital resources, but helps establish institutions to attract funds for regional and subregional projects which, in turn, supply development assistance.

The annual Commission sessions provide the main guidance on ESCAP's program and activities to the Secretariat, which prepares reports and compiles statistics on current economic issues in the region for distribution to member governments. The Secretariat also prepares and services the meetings of the Commission and the following seven substantive committees: Agricultural Development; Development Planning and Statistics; Industry, Human Settlements and Technology; Natural Resources; Population and Social Development; Trade; and Shipping, Transport and Communications. The present work program and activities are concentrated in six priority areas: food and agriculture; energy; raw materials and commodities; transfer of technology; international trade; and integrated rural development.

ESCAP is primarily funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ESCAP receives funding from other UN agencies, most notably UNDP, to which the United States is a major contributor. Finally, the United States has from time to time participated in individual ESCAP programs of special interest by providing extra-budgetary contributions.

The 45th Commission session was held in Bangkok from March 27 to April 5. At that meeting, the Commission adopted five resolutions on the following issues: regional social development strategy; depository center for UN human rights materials; International Literacy Year; integrated rural development program; and International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction. All the resolutions were adopted by consensus.

Discussion at the 45th session centered on the need for increased regional trade as a cushion against protectionist pressures; implementation of the Jakarta Plan of Action which was agreed to at the 44th session; resolution of a long-standing dispute between India and Bangladesh on the study on the viability of establishing a regional inland water transport center in Bangladesh; and special problems facing the Pacific island countries.

Almost all members of the commission, including significantly the Soviet Union, spoke out in favor of restructuring their economies along market oriented lines. While there was general agreement that restructuring was necessary, the relevance of the experiences of Japan, the newly industrialized economies (Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan), and most recently ASEAN, as models for development for all the countries of the region was questioned.

There was general endorsement of the need to rely more on intraregional trade and regional cooperation to offset the potentially adverse impact on trade of the trend towards protectionist pressures. The U.S. Delegate to the session emphasized the role of the U.S. administration in resisting such pressures.

During the discussion of restructuring and the role of human resources development, the United States, strongly supported by the Australians and others, insisted on a reference in the Secretariat's study on human resources development about the need for ESCAP to avoid duplication of the efforts of other UN agencies.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) was established in 1948 as a regional organization to promote the economic development of Latin America and to strengthen economic ties among Latin American countries and between them and the rest of the world. To this end, ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. ECLAC has 35 Western Hemisphere members (including the United States and Canada), five nonregional members (France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain) and five associate members (Aruba, British Virgin Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles and Montserrat). ECLAC is headquartered in Santiago, Chile, and has branch offices in Washington, D.C., and in six Latin American countries.

ECLAC's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the region in the area of economic development. ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. The biennial Commission sessions provide guidance for ECLAC's programs and activities.

ECLAC is funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ECLAC receives funding from other UN agencies, most notably UNDP and UNFPA, as well as from bilateral sources.

ECLAC's general sessions or plenaries are held in even years, usually in a different Latin American capital each time. The 22nd ECLAC plenary, which met in Rio de Janeiro April 20–27, 1988, adopted resolutions on technical and economic cooperation among developing countries and regions; the preparation of the new International Development Strategy (IDS) for the Fourth UN Development Decade; and the need to take the environment into account in fostering sustainable development. In addition, the plenary session approved ECLAC's work program for 1990–1991.

A majority of delegations which spoke during the plenary debate called for additional measures by the creditor nations and commercial banks to address the debt problem, with a number of developing countries demanding outright debt reduction or relief. The plenary interventions by a number of delegations, however, particularly the Caribbeans, were more positive than in previous sessions. There was greater emphasis by the developing countries themselves on the need for domestic reforms as a basis for making progress on their economic and financial problems.

The statement of the head of the U.S. Delegation, Ambassador Richard Williamson, focused on the direct relationship and interplay between economic and political freedom. Outlining the U.S. position on the external debt problems of the Latin American countries, Ambassador Williamson stated that there was a need for economic reforms as the basis for growth. He emphasized the need to develop the private sector, get governments out of the productive sectors, and remove excessive government regulation of economic activity. Ambassador Williamson further stressed the importance of a freer trading system and the critical role of the Uruguay Round in advancing the trade prospects of developing countries as well as those of the industrialized world. Finally, Ambassador Williamson emphasized the willingness of the United States to pursue a cooperative approach to the development of the region and called for ECLAC to help meet the needs of the present and the future— not of times past.

The ECLAC Committee of the Whole, which meets in the intervening years between Commission plenary sessions, met in New York, March 30–31, to discuss recent economic trends in the region and ECLAC's contribution to the formulation of a new International Development Strategy (IDS). The Committee of the Whole adopted two resolutions: one dealing with the IDS and the other inviting reconstruction assistance to Nicaragua in the wake of a 1988 hurricane. The U.S. Delegation called for a vote and voted against the resolution on assistance to Nicaragua. The vote was 23 for, 1 against (U.S.) and no abstentions. In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Delegate said that the Sandinista regime, rather than the hurricane, was to blame for the dismal state of the Nicaraguan economy and called on the Sandinistas to live up to their commitments under the Esquipulas II Accord to bring about truly democratic conditions in Nicaragua.

Economic Commission for Africa

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) was established in 1958 as a regional organization to promote economic development in Africa. Full membership is limited to independent African countries, of which 51 are currently members. The United States, while not a member, maintains liaison with ECA headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and attends some of its meetings as an observer. During 1983–1987, the United States provided financial and technical assistance through the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The ECA is charged with promoting the economic and social development of Africa; strengthening economic relations among African countries and territories; undertaking studies on economic development; collecting, evaluating and disseminating economic and technical information; and helping to formulate policies to promote economic development. ECA also provides advisory services to its members in various economic and social fields.

The ECA is funded primarily by the UN regular budget. In addition, the ECA receives funding from other UN agencies and bilateral donors. U.S. AID concluded a technical assistance agreement with the ECA in 1983 to provide $710,000 during 1983–1987 for the support of two projects aimed at: (1) strengthening human resources planning and development management training at the Institute for Economic Development and Planning in Dakar, Senegal, and (2) improving the communications capability of ECA's African Training and Research Center for Women.

The 24th session of the Commission and 15th meeting of the Conference of Ministers met in Addis Ababa, April 6–10. The Conference adopted resolutions relating to, *inter alia*, the following topics: proclamation of a Second Industrial Decade for Africa, an African Alternative Framework for Structural Adjustment Programs, women in development and the current economic situation in Africa.

The central issue discussed at the Conference was the African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programs. A report on the African Alternative was adopted by the African Ministers of Economic Planning and Development and the Ministers of Finance during the 24th session of the Conference. The African Alternative Framework asserts that World Bank/IMF-sponsored structural adjustment programs in Africa have failed and suggests changes in the implementation of these programs. Delegates to the session called into question findings of a joint World Bank/UNDP report that structural adjustment programs had led to improvements in a number of African countries.

Resolutions on the African Alternative Framework were adopted by the ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly. The United States cast the sole vote against the Assembly resolution. In its explanation of vote, the U.S. Delegation stressed that while the United States believed that the African Alternative Framework has made a useful contribution to the dialogue on African economic policies, it did not accept the underlying assumptions of the African Alternative that adjustment had not worked and that a new "framework" was needed.

Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) was established in 1974. Currently, there are 14 members including the PLO. Although a UN member of the region involved, Israel was effectively excluded from membership because of the original wording of the 1973 ECOSOC resolution establishing the Commission. The United States objected at the time, considering that the language was contrary to the terms of the UN Charter. The Commission's headquarters was moved from Beirut to Baghdad in 1981 because of war damage in Beirut. The name of the Commission was changed in 1986 from the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) to its current name to reflect the Commission's greater emphasis on social issues. ESCWA is funded by the UN regular budget.

The 15th session of ESCWA was held May 13–18, in Baghdad. The United States did not participate in the proceedings.

Discussions in the 15th session of current issues of importance to the region focused on privatization and the experience of member countries with turning over public entities to the private sector. In addition, the Commission adopted 14 resolutions dealing with the following topics: the economic and social condition of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Territories, environment and development in the region, activities of the Transport and Communications Decade in Western Asia, and the Commission's contribution to the International Development Strategy (IDS) for the Fourth UN Development Decade. In interventions during the session, delegates expressed concern about the world economic situation, debt crisis, lack of progress in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict, and economic and human destruction in Lebanon.

UN Development Program

The UN Development Program (UNDP) is a voluntary fund which finances the world's largest multilateral program of grant technical cooperation. UNDP was established in 1966 through the merger of two earlier UN programs, the Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. The General Assembly established UNDP to be the principal UN mechanism for financing technical cooperation activities. UNDP provides grant technical assistance to developing countries and territories at their request, with increasing emphasis on assistance to the poorest countries. In 1989 UNDP projects were underway in some 150 countries and territories.

UNDP's programs consist of projects lasting from a few months to several years in agriculture (land and water utilization, food processing), industry (product development, pilot plants), education (teacher training, literacy programs), health (maternal and child health care services, medical training), economic policy and planning (institutes for economic planning, national statistical services), transportation (water and air transportation, rural transportation) and natural resource exploration (mining techniques, mineral exploration techniques).

UNDP also undertakes smaller projects such as fellowships for the training of nationals of developing countries and provides such countries with needed skills through the use of expert advisers.

In addition, UNDP undertakes preinvestment and feasibility studies to promote developing country and external investor interest in capital projects aimed at expanding production and employment. Projects funded by UNDP are normally executed by one of the 29 participating agencies of the UN system, such as FAO, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), UNIDO, ILO, UNESCO, World Bank or ICAO. UNDP also directly undertakes a small but increasing number of projects through its own Office for Projects Services.

UNDP is headquartered in New York. Its Administrator, William H. Draper III, of the United States, assumed office in May 1986, and was reappointed on January 1, 1990, for a second 4-year term.

GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BODIES

UNDP is a subsidiary organ of the UN General Assembly, which sets overall UNDP policy. UNDP's operating policies are established and its programs and budgets approved by a Governing Council composed of representatives of 48 states—21 developed and 27 developing.* The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC, which elects states to the Council for 3-year terms. In view of the leading role which the United States plays in UNDP affairs, the United States has been a member of the Governing Council since its establishment. The Council holds regular sessions once a year in June. There is also a brief organizational meeting in February as well as a shorter special session to deal with special items which come up between sessions of the regular Governing Council.

---

* The following states were members of the UNDP Governing Council in 1989:
Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Democratic Republic of Germany, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Republic of Korea, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

The UNDP Governing Council provided oversight for the following bodies in 1989: UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, UN Sudano-Sahelian Office, UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development, UN Trust Fund for Colonial Countries and Peoples, Energy Account, UN Special Fund for Landlocked Developing Countries, UN Development Fund for Women, Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries and the Inter-Agency Procurement Services Office. The Council also provides policy guidance for the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), a small program of technical assistance financed from the regular UN budget, and is the governing body for the UN Population Fund (UNFPA).

SECRETARIAT AND FIELD ORGANIZATION

UNDP's administrative apparatus consists of a Secretariat in New York and 112 field offices in developing countries and territories where programs are being carried out. Assisted by their staffs, UNDP Resident Representatives advise recipient governments on development planning and UN assistance. Within their countries of assignment, they coordinate UNDP programs and, where appropriate, those of the UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, the UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration and UNFPA. Resident Representatives also act for and support the work of the implementing agencies and other UN agencies including the World Food Program, the UN Environment Program, the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

In most countries, the UN Secretary General has designated the UNDP Resident Representative as Resident Coordinator of the UN's Operational Activities for Development. As such, he or she is responsible for overseeing all UN agency development activities in the country to which he/she is accredited. The United States has led a move to a more efficient division of labor between UNDP and sectoral agencies, further decentralization of UNDP and agency project support functions to the country level and greater integration of UN system field activities. These reform efforts address both donor-supported (cost/effectiveness) and recipient government-supported (management and administrative capacity-building) objectives.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Patterns of Development Assistance

UNDP development assistance is allocated to countries and to inter-country activities based on anticipated development assistance allocations called Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), which cover 5-year planning cycles. The First Planning Cycle extended from 1972 through 1976, the Second Cycle was from 1977 through 1981, the Third Cycle was from 1982 through 1986, and the Fourth Cycle began in 1987 and will run through 1991. IPFs in the First Cycle were set largely on the basis of the aid that UNDP supplied from 1967 through 1971. That is, countries had a claim upon UNDP resources during that cycle equal to the percentage of UNDP assistance they actually received in the earlier 5-year period. IPF figures for the Second Planning Cycle were primarily based on country populations and per capita GNPs. In allocating the IPFs for the Third Cycle, the Governing Council gave highest priority to countries with the lowest per capita GNPs or which were otherwise disadvantaged (Decision 80/30, adopted by consensus June 26, 1980). For the Fourth Cycle, about 64 percent of country program resources has been allocated to countries with a per capita GNP of $375 or less, and the concept of graduation requires that recipient countries with per capita income of $3,000 or more attain net contributor status.

Activities and Analysis

The organizational meeting and special session of the Governing Council met in February 1989 in New York. Debate in the organizational meeting centered on preparations for the 36th regular session of the Governing Council.

The special session meeting immediately following the organizational meeting decided upon the procedural aspects of preparatory and formal discussions of the future role of UNDP in the 1990s at the 36th Governing Council. The special session also considered the guidelines for the newly established Management Development Program (MDP) and agreed upon a tentative schedule for preparations of the negotiations of resource allocations for the Fifth Programming Cycle to be decided in 1990. In a key decision that could lead to far reaching changes in how the various elements of the UN system work together, the special session agreed on Terms of Reference for a study of Successor Arrangements for Agency Support Costs. Other issues considered were the question of "graduation" of some developing countries which have been resistant to becoming net contributors, and which therefore attempted unsuccessfully to weaken the application of the concept. The session reviewed the allocations for the centrally managed Special Program Resources (SPRs).

The Governing Council held its 36th session in June in New York. The key issue considered, and the subject of the High Level Debate, was the future role of UNDP in the 1990s. UNDP had prepared a series of draft proposals which member states and other UN organizations had reviewed and debated informally prior to the Council.

The Latin American members tried to delay serious consideration of the issue until 1990, when it could be linked to Fifth Cycle resource allocation. The Council, nevertheless, achieved agreement on a decision which did begin the process of defining the policy and program direction of UNDP. The decision reemphasizes the need to focus UNDP's activities on national capacity building, set out terms of reference for development of a funding strategy for UNDP placing its resources within the broad context of worldwide technical assistance flows from the UN system, multilateral development banks and bilateral donors (a U.S. idea supported by all donors), and established a process for reviewing and improving the governance and members' oversight of UNDP.

The Council adopted a restructured and more transparent administrative budget for the 1990–1991 biennium which clearly distinguishes field from headquarters costs. The budget allows a real growth of 5.7 percent for support to UNDP's core activities, substantially below the 8.8 percent requested by the Administrator, but in keeping with UNDP's needs.

Other decisions the Council took:

— Required the Administrator to provide a comprehensive review of the senior management structure by the 37th Governing Council session (a donor initiative that the United States supported).

— Required UNDP to evaluate the impact of the reforms it has undertaken since 1985 on the quality of its programs (a U.S. initiative).

— Required the UNDP to reopen discussions with technical agencies which had yet to sign a standard basic executing agency agreement with UNDP for the execution of UNDP projects (a U.S.-Federal Republic of Germany initiative to increase the accountability of UN agencies implementing UNDP projects).

— Decided to continue UNDP's support of the World Maritime University at the present funding level of $1.2 million per year for the 1990–1991 biennium (a U.S.-Sweden initiative).

— Negotiated a text on the UN Program of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development (1986–1990) which inserted some balance by including the delineation of the responsibilities of the African states themselves into the original African text.

— Agreed on a decision which requires UNDP and DTCD to review and work out improvements in their division of labor following up on the results of a recent U.S. study of the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (a U.S. initiative).

Two sessions of the working group of the Committee of the Whole were held in New York during 1989. Discussions in the working group are informal, and have not agreed upon decisions or records of meetings. They provide members a forum for open and less formal exchange among donors and recipients in reviewing UNDP programming and policies.

Items dealt with in the working group in 1989 were the impact and sustainability of UNDP-assisted projects, technical cooperation among developing countries, review of aspects of the future role of UNDP, the Management Development Program, and the operational implications of UN General Assembly resolution 44/211 with a focus on government/national execution, decentralization and accountability.

The United States made a voluntary contribution of $109,919,000 to UNDP in 1989, down marginally from $110 million in 1988. Our contribution represented 11.7 percent of resources pledged to UNDP for 1989.

UN VOLUNTEERS

The UN Volunteers (UNV) program, established by the General Assembly at its 25th session, began operation in January 1971. The program provides educated and skilled volunteers to developing countries to assist them in development activities. Volunteers are recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible, including, in particular, the developing countries. The Volunteers are specialists at the level (middle-level and operational) for which they volunteer and are assigned.

The General Assembly designated the Administrator of the UN Development Program (UNDP) as the Administrator of the UNV. A coordinator based in Geneva promotes and coordinates the recruitment, selection and administrative management of the activities of the Volunteers within the UN system. This arrangement permits dovetailing of UNDP's technical assistance activities with the expertise available through the Volunteer program. Many Volunteers are assigned to UNDP field offices, to projects funded by UNDP or the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

UNDP resources, as well as financing from the Special Voluntary Fund and other resources, support the activities of the Volunteers. Expenditures for 1989 amounted to $37 million. This consisted of: $20.2 million allocated to the projects directly executed by UNV and the external costs of all volunteers from developing countries; and $16.8 million for financing UNVs assigned to projects executed by other UN agencies.

The U.S. Peace Corps works closely with UNV to recruit and sponsor American volunteers. The Peace Corps also provides their external expenses. In

1989 the United States, through the Peace Corps budget, pledged $100,000 to the Special Voluntary Fund. This sum represents 8.86 percent of total pledges amounting to $1,128,987. Leading contributors to the Fund in 1989 were Italy ($481,481), Switzerland ($219,552), Belgium ($214,477) and Denmark ($100,000). However, among industrialized sending countries, the United States, with 39 Volunteers, has more of its nationals assigned to UNV than any other country.

The number of Volunteers in service reached 1,801 in 1989, of which 1,594 (88.5 percent) were from developing countries. They are currently serving in 102 countries on every continent. Volunteers are assigned to many sectors of development, primarily agriculture, health and education.

The UNDP Governing Council considers the UNV Program at every other regular session, and therefore did not include the program on the agenda of the 36th session. The Coordinator of the UNV Program, Brenda McSweeney, was present during the meeting and held informal consultations with delegations. The U.S. Delegation organized a meeting among other donor delegates to discuss the program with Ms. McSweeney, particularly the concerns of donors with the small number of volunteers from industrialized countries. In accordance with a U.S. suggestion, a provision was included in the overall decision on budget estimates for the biennium for 1990–1991 which approves a revaluation of the parameters for the UNV core budget to $17 million for the biennium, and of the per capita charge relating to the supplementary budget to $3,700 pending a review of the UNV budget process, and agreement on detailed improvements which will take place at the 37th Governing Council session.

The Council, in its decisions: requested the administrator to inform the Council on the results of consultation meetings held with other volunteer sending organizations; recognized the need to streamline recruitment procedures and improve cooperation with volunteer sending societies so that the universal character of the program can be reflected in the diversity of the volunteers' countries of origin; requested the administrator to report on the steps taken and results obtained in these areas at the 37th session; stressed the need for adequate and improved pre-assignment preparation, cross-cultural orientation and language training for all volunteers; supported increased collaboration in this area with the sending societies; and stressed the need for precise job descriptions for UNVs', including the framework within which the volunteers' position has been established, and for increased attention to the adequate matching of volunteers' skills with the assignments.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is not part of the UN system, although it was created at a UN-sponsored conference and GATT cooperates with UN organizations, where appropriate. For example, the

GATT Contracting Parties and UNCTAD jointly operate an International Trade Center to assist developing countries in promoting their exports.

The GATT entered into force in January 1948. The United States has been a party to GATT since its inception. By the end of 1989, 98 countries, accounting for more than four-fifths of world trade, were members. An additional 28 countries maintain a *de facto* "application" of the GATT.

GATT is the principal multilateral instrument through which the United States seeks to improve the world trading system. It is both a code of rules and forum in which negotiations and other trade discussions take place. GATT is intended to play a major role in the settlement of trade disagreements between member countries.

FUNDAMENTALS OF GATT

Most-Favored-Nation: GATT members must extend to all other members the most favorable treatment granted to any trading partner. This nondiscriminatory treatment ensures that any tariff reduction or other trade concession is automatically extended to all GATT parties, multiplying its liberalizing effects. The GATT allows some exceptions, primarily for customs unions such as the European Community and the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement.

National Treatment: GATT members also must give imported goods treatment equal to that accorded domestic goods in the domestic markets. Any restrictions applied to imported products must also apply to like domestic products.

Emphasis on Tariff Protection: The GATT generally prohibits quantitative restrictions or quotas. Contracting parties must, to the extent possible, provide any protection necessary to their industries solely by means of tariffs, which are transparent and subject to negotiation in the GATT.

Dispute Settlement: Parties may challenge trade actions of other parties which may be inconsistent with the GATT. GATT members decide whether to accept by consensus the resulting findings of a panel of trade experts.

International trade has grown dramatically, in volume (over 32-fold), importance and complexity, since the inception of the GATT. This growth is due in part to the consensus embodied in the agreement that the world's economic welfare depends on freer trade, without the risk of escalating tariff wars. Seven rounds of multilateral negotiations under the GATT have succeeded in reducing average tariffs in the industrial countries from over 40 percent to less than 5 percent today.

The Tokyo Round (1974–1979) extended GATT rules to trade measures other than tariffs by establishing additional international agreements—the Tokyo

Round Codes—on the use of subsidies and countervailing duties, antidumping actions, technical barriers to trade (standards), import licensing, government procurement, customs valuation, and trade in bovine meat, dairy products and civil aircraft. GATT members may choose whether or not to undertake the obligations, and receive the benefits, of these codes; the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (known as the Standards Code) is the largest with 27 members. Code committees in each area meet periodically to review implementation by participants.

THE URUGUAY ROUND

The eighth and current multilateral round of trade negotiations under GATT auspices was launched in September 1986 at Punta del Este, Uruguay. The concluding conference will be held in Brussels in December 1990. The new round, known as the Uruguay Round, is the most comprehensive of multilateral trade negotiations ever attempted. The Uruguay Round is a key element in the U.S. effort to open markets and fight protectionism.

In November 1982 the contracting parties met at the ministerial level for the first time in 10 years. Work began in 1983 and continued through 1986, culminating in the ministerial agreement initiating the Uruguay Round (GATT document NIN/DEC 20 September 1986). The Round has launched the first multilateral negotiations on services and has incorporated them with negotiations on goods as a part of a single trade negotiation. Ministers agreed to establish a Trade Negotiations Committee to manage the overall negotiations and two negotiating groups to carry out the actual negotiations: a Group on Negotiations on Goods to negotiate traditional GATT issues, including trade related to investment and intellectual property, and a Group on Negotiations on Services to deal with services' matters.

After the Punta del Este Ministerial, the focus of the Uruguay Round negotiations shifted to the GATT seat in Geneva. The United States has played a prominent role in the negotiations, participating fully in the activities of the 15 negotiating groups dealing with various issues. Progress has been made in many important areas, but much remains to be done before the scheduled conclusion of the Round in 1990. At midterm review meetings held in December 1988 and April 1989, trade ministers from the contracting parties participating in the Round reached agreement on negotiating frameworks for the 15 negotiating groups.

The Uruguay Round is now in its final and critical year. The United States has made it clear that, at a minimum, it wants comprehensive reform of agricultural trade, expanded market access for goods, greater disciplines over trade-distorting subsidies, meaningful disciplines in the "new areas" (intellectual property, services and investment) and more complete integration of developing countries into the global trading system.

Like previous rounds, the Uruguay Round includes a challenging set of negotiations on market access—tariffs and nontariff measures restricting trade.

Efforts to improve market access include specialized negotiations to reduce barriers to trade in tropical products, natural resource-based products and textiles.

In addition, however, we expect the final package to include agreements in new areas of trade—services trade, trade-related investment measures and protection of trade-related intellectual property. The U.S. draft text on services would allow services' providers throughout the world to set up shop in foreign markets and compete like local firms.

In the area of investment, the United States has proposed a "two-tiered" scheme which would prohibit some investment measures and establish rules governing the use of others. U.S. goals on intellectual property include higher standards of protection, effective enforcement of those standards and an effective dispute settlement mechanism.

A top priority for the United States is agreement on new market-oriented rules to reduce, and ultimately eliminate, the host of government measures which distort world agricultural trade. U.S. calls for progressive elimination of export subsidies, substantially reduced tariffs and nontariff barriers and trade-distorting domestic supports and resolution of health and safety issues have received substantial support.

Finally, we hope to gain agreement on improved GATT rules for tighter discipline on subsidies and on trade restrictions for balance-of-payments reasons, stronger dispute settlement procedures and greater commitment by developing countries to GATT rules. The United States has strongly pressed its goal of achieving one set of trading rules for all GATT members, including the developing world. Developing countries account for over half a trillion dollars in trade and are no longer on the fringes of the trading system.

UN Conference on Trade and Development

The UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is a major organ of the United Nations concerned with economic issues including trade, commodities, debt and development. UNCTAD provides a forum for its 168 members to discuss these issues, makes recommendations to the UN General Assembly, produces statistical reports on the economic relationship between developed and developing countries and provides technical assistance to developing countries in the areas of trade and development.

Plenary sessions of the Conference meet at intervals of about every 4 years to set policy and to outline the direction to be taken in the work program. Between Conference sessions, the Trade and Development Board (TDB) meets semiannually to carry out the function of the Conference when it is not in session. The Trade and Development Board reports to the

Conference and to the UN General Assembly through ECOSOC. The last session of the Conference, UNCTAD VII, met in Geneva, July 9–31, 1987.

UNCTAD was originally associated with the New International Economic Order (NIEO), an ambitious approach advocated by developing countries to correct the economic gap between developing and developed countries by determining rules governing the movement of goods, services, technology and capital across international boundaries. Under UNCTAD's aegis, various agreements have been concluded or have been proposed in the areas of maritime shipping, transfer of technology and commodities. Much of UNCTAD's bias toward the New International Economic Order has dissipated over the years because UNCTAD members increasingly rely on market-oriented reforms to stimulate economic growth and because negotiations of general guidelines for regulating economic relationships between nations have proven difficult.

At UNCTAD VII, a final act was adopted that consisted of an assessment of global economic trends and recommendations for policy approaches and specific measures aimed at revitalizing development, growth and international trade. The United States joined in consensus on the final act, partly, because it included unprecedented emphasis on the role of the private sector in developing countries and because it stressed the responsibility of developing countries to undertake domestic market-oriented reforms for economic development.

The TDB's 1989 meetings were less controversial than meetings in the past. At the spring meeting, discussions were lively although actual decisions were noncontroversial. Most developed country members gave statements focusing on the necessity for market-oriented economic reforms while the G–77 statements focused on real and imagined trade protectionism. The TDB finally adopted a decision on protectionism and structural adjustment which urged governments to halt protectionism in accordance with the UNCTAD VII mandate and requested the UNCTAD Secretariat to study the costs of nontariff trading measures. A discussion on UNCTAD's role with respect to sustainable development resulted in the UNCTAD Secretariat being charged with preparing a paper on the subject for the fall 1990 TDB meeting. The East-South trade discussion led to a decision to charge an intergovernmental group of experts with a limited mandate to promote greater East-South trade and to have this group report to the spring 1990 TDB meeting.

At the fall session, discussion focused on debt issues. The TDB adopted a consensus resolution on debt that welcomed improvements in the debt strategy and which called on rapid and effective use of the strategy, in conjunction with appropriate economic policies. The fall session also marked UNCTAD's 25th anniversary, began preparations for the eighth UNCTAD quadrennial conference in 1991 and discussed UNCTAD's contribution to the second UN Conference on Least Developed Countries.

Substantial New Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries

The Substantial New Program of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries (SNPA) was adopted by the General Assembly at its 36th session in 1981. The program called on both the developed and developing countries to mobilize financial resources, expand trade and investment, develop and implement sound economic structural adjustment policies and improve coordination of aid efforts throughout the remainder of the 1980s. The United States joined consensus in adopting the program but made a statement detailing the numerous reservations it had about the program, e. g., the call for aid targets tied to donor countries' GNP.

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, the Assembly adopted resolution 42/117 calling for a Second Conference on the Least Developed Countries in 1990 to be hosted by France. Since France agreed to bear the expense of the Conference, the United States joined consensus in adopting the resolution while reiterating its reservations expressed at the time the SNPA was originally adopted.

Officials from donor countries and multilateral and bilateral financial and technical assistance institutions met with representatives of the least developed countries May 22–31, in Geneva, to prepare for the 1990 Paris Conference. In his statement to the conference, the U.S. Representative said that the United States was keenly interested in playing an active role as partners in the development of least developed countries. He noted that several least developed countries had begun to undertake serious efforts to achieve the stabilization and market-oriented structural change necessary for sustainable economic growth. He cautioned that results would not come overnight. The confidence of the private sector, he said, would not be easily won after years of over regulation and control. The U.S. Representative concluded his statement by expressing the hope that the constructive interchange of views evidenced during the meeting would provide a basis for subsequent discussions seeking new directions in the 1990s.

On December 22 the United States joined the consensus adopting resolution 44/220 which notes steps being taken by the UN system in preparing for the Conference and encourages UNDP to continue its efforts to facilitate preparations for the Conference. The General Assembly also invited member states to make voluntary contributions to the UNDP-administered Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries to facilitate the participation of representatives of the least developed countries in the preparatory meetings and Conference itself.

Commission on Transnational Corporations

The Commission on Transnational Corporations (TNC) was established in 1974 by ECOSOC resolution 1913 (LVII) to assist the Council "in fulfilling its responsibilities in the field of transnational corporations." Its mandate includes: (1) acting as the forum within the UN system for consideration of issues relating to transnational corporations; (2) promoting the exchange of views among governments, intergovernmental groups, trade unions and business and consumer groups; (3) providing guidance to the Center on Transnational Corporations, and; (4) developing a Code of Conduct relating to TNCs.

The 15th session of the UN Commission on TNCs was held April 5–14. The discussion at this session was more realistic and less confrontational than in previous years. At the meeting, Eastern European countries and developing countries recognized the need for greater foreign direct investment. Other topics discussed included environmental accounting to take into account the true cost of resource use in GNP statistics and the role of service industries in developing countries. The United States and the United Kingdom voted against a resolution calling for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, arguing that such sanctions are ineffective in changing South Africa's policies and are harmful to Black workers. The United States also opposed a role for the Commission on dealing with debt issues because these issues are being adequately dealt with in the international financial institutions.

CODE OF CONDUCT

In 1977 the Commission established the Intergovernmental Working Group (IGWG) to draft language for an international code of conduct for transnational corporations. The IGWG met 17 times through 1982 but was unable to find language acceptable to all the parties involved. At its eighth session in 1982, the Commission adopted a resolution calling for a special session of the Commission to be convened in 1983 to complete the work on the Code. From 1983 to 1987, the special session was reconvened each year to consider further steps to be taken in regard to the Code of Conduct for TNCs.

During its 15th session, the Commission decided to continue informal consultations on a Code of Conduct for TNCs with a view to resuming negotiations as soon as possible. In his statement, the U.S. Delegate, Robert C. Reis, Jr., noted that major issues remained outstanding and restated the U.S. position in favor of a balanced code, one that lays out satisfactorily the responsibilities of governments as well as corporations. The U.S. Delegate also stated that any code should reflect changes in attitudes toward the world economy that have taken place since much of the Code was drafted in the late 1970s. Other delegations suggested that the Code contain an adequate reference to international law, provide for the protection of private property (including intellectual property), and promote the free flow of capital.

UN Children's Fund

The UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) was founded in 1946 to help meet the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of World War II. It now provides long-term humanitarian assistance to needy children and mothers in developing countries throughout the world, and promotes and supports health and development activities directed toward child survival and other needs of children. Because of its apolitical character, UNICEF has been able to operate all over the world, including areas in political turmoil such as the Sudan, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola and Afghanistan. Milestones in UNICEF's history include the Nobel Prize in 1965 and the celebration of its 40th anniversary in 1986.

The Executive Director receives policy guidance and direction from the UNICEF Executive Board composed of 41 member states elected for 3-year terms. The United States has always been a member of this Board, which meets annually at a 2-week session. Special sessions or mail polls may be used to decide issues that cannot wait until the next regular session of the Board.

PROGRAMS

UNICEF allocates resources among countries on the basis of need, using criteria that include: infant mortality rates (IMR), under-5 child morbidity and mortality, infant and child population and per capita GNP. In 1983 the UNICEF Executive Board decided that the IMR should be the most important criteria that would "guide both the level and the content of UNICEF program cooperation." UNICEF's programs are carefully developed and tailored to the recipient country's specific needs and priorities on the basis of a child-needs assessment. Rarely are UNICEF's funds the sole source of support for a program; they serve in most instances as a catalyst or critical ingredient to ensure the program's success.

UNICEF programs emphasize developing community-level services to promote the health and well-being of children, including water supply, primary health care, nutrition, education, as well as other child development activities and improving the situation of mothers. They also assist governments in recipient countries through advisory services, inter-country exchanges, other local training exercises and promotion of social mobilization efforts. In addition, UNICEF helps procure, package and deliver medical and other health or education supplies through its centralized supply procurement, packaging and warehousing system which is known as UNIPAC (i.e., UN Procurement and Assembly Center) located in Copenhagen, Denmark. UNICEF is the largest supplier of vaccines to countries for the WHO Expanded Program of Immunization (EPI), which has had as its goal 80 percent immunization coverage of all the world's children against the six major childhood immunizable diseases by 1990 and disease specific goals by 1995 and 2000.

In 1989 UNICEF spent $501 million (i.e., $251 million from general resources and $250 million from supplementary funds) on projects in 121 countries. This amount included: $203 million (40 percent) for child health activities, $28 million (6 percent) for child nutrition, $76 million (15 percent) on water supply and sanitation, $35 million (7 percent) on community and family-based services for children, $37 million (7 percent) on education, $48 million (10 percent) for emergency relief and $74 million (15 percent) for general activities —mainly planning and program preparation, program communications and other program support.

In general, supplementary funds are used for "noted" projects. UNICEF identifies many worthwhile projects each year for which it does not have funds in its general resources. These "noted projects" are listed in an annual catalog approved by the Executive Board and, with few exceptions, are implemented when donors contribute additional funds for a specific project. In addition, UNICEF sometimes appeals for emergency funds to assist children and mothers affected by natural or man-made disasters. The United States contributed over $10.6 million in supplementary funds in 1989, with about $7.8 million going to child survival/EPI programs in such countries as India and Nigeria; and $2.76 million for emergencies and relief/rehabilitation assistance in Benin, Somalia and the "Operation Lifeline Sudan" program in the Sudan.

THE CHILD SURVIVAL AND DEVELOPMENT REVOLUTION

In the early 1980s, the world health community recognized that several curative and preventative health technologies had become relatively cheap but were not yet widely available—especially in remote areas—or widely accepted and used. If these techniques were properly promoted and utilized, UNICEF reasoned, it would be possible by the year 2000 to reduce by half the number of childhood deaths (estimated at 40,000 per day) resulting from childhood immunizable diseases and dehydration from diarrheal diseases. UNICEF's "Child Survival and Development Revolution" (CSDR) was launched in 1983, and includes the use of four principal tools:

1. **Growth Charts to detect malnutrition.** These are available in 200 languages and dialects for use in some 80 countries.

2. **Oral Rehydration Therapy (ORT).** Diarrhea-caused dehydration is a major killer of children. A combination of sugar and salts mixed with water prevents dehydration. This part of the child survival strategy complements UNICEF's traditional water supply and sanitation programs.

3. **Breast-feeding.** UNICEF promotes breast-feeding and proper weaning techniques as a way to prevent infant malnutrition and disease and as a natural birth-spacing technique.

4. **Immunization against the six major childhood immunizable diseases—measles, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio and tuberculosis.** Better and cheaper refrigeration networks, as well as vaccines

that are less susceptible to heat and damage, make this program possible. Family spacing, food production and female literacy also are included in the child survival strategy.

UNICEF's approach has attracted unprecedented media attention and support from the international community, including endorsements from many world leaders. In 1985 the UN Secretary General wrote to the Chief of State of every UN member country to call attention to the World Health Organization goal of achieving Universal Childhood Immunization (UCI) by 1990 and a 50 percent use of ORT by parents by 1989. Since this appeal was launched, 77 countries—with over 90 percent of the developing world's children—have informed the Secretary General of their intention to strive to achieve UCI by 1990.

1989 SESSION OF THE UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The UNICEF Executive Board held its regular session in New York, April 17–28. Board members noted UNICEF's lead agency role in child survival activities and the need to ensure sustainable progress in those areas. Delegations supported the basic goals in UNICEF's medium-term plan for 1988–1992, program thrusts, and the priority accorded to Africa, and provided guidance to UNICEF with regard to its "strategies for children in the 1990s."

The Board expressed appreciation for UNICEF's response to emergency situations in Africa. The United States and other Board member countries paid special tribute to UNICEF Executive Director James P. Grant for his work and (concurrent) appointment as the Personal Representative of UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar for the leadership of the UN emergency relief effort "Operation Lifeline Sudan."

The Board approved a framework and initial funding for preparatory work in support of the "Bamako Initiative"—a plan adopted by African Health Ministers in September 1987 with a goal of revitalizing primary health care in Africa. The plan seeks to encourage decentralized, self-sustaining primary health care by mobilizing communities to share in the financing and management of local primary health care services maintained by the proceeds from the sale of good quality essential drugs at low cost. UNICEF's involvement in helping to combat the global AIDS pandemic within the context of the global AIDS program was endorsed and the Board approved new programs to respond to AIDS as well as acute respiratory infections (ARI). UNICEF was commended for its programs to increase the integration of women's concerns into its program sectors.

The Executive Board also took note of work toward adoption of a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child by the UN General Assembly in 1989; requested the Executive Director to develop a policy strategy for improving nutrition of mothers and children in the developing world; urged continued cooperation and collaboration of UNICEF with all relevant UN system bodies, organs, etc.; endorsed the establishment of a joint UNESCO/UNICEF Committee on Education Policy; and supported increased attention to environmental issues within UNICEF's mandate and country-programming approach.

Another important issue before the Board was UNICEF's external relations activities. The 1989 Executive Board also considered the second in a series of policy papers on UNICEF's external relations activities. This stemmed from the Board's continuing concern about the growing volume and importance of UNICEF's external relations activities, their implications for program delivery and related institutional and structural questions (e.g., mandate of the UNICEF office in Geneva, compared to that of headquarters and the role of the national committees). Some members were concerned that the expanded and diversified external relations, advocacy work, social mobilization, information and specific fundraising activities (e.g., greeting card operation) and public affairs events, could divert staff and financial resources from the regular programs to the extent that their sustainability might suffer.

In 1987 the Board had asked for a study of the functioning of UNICEF's regional offices (including the Geneva office) and the optimization of its external relations. The Executive Director's response, presented to the 1988 Board meeting, was not entirely sufficient. Thus, the Board requested further clarification of the policy for and functions of UNICEF's external relations, accompanied by guidelines for future external relations activities.

The policy paper UNICEF subsequently presented to the April 1989 Executive Board attempted to clarify the external relations activities and proposed related organizational changes, dividing the Division of Information and Public Affairs into two to assure strengthened support, especially to the national committees' activities.

Board concerns remained, nevertheless, and the Board decided to ask the Secretariat for a new, more analytical study. It would analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of current external relations activities and outline the plans for the future. UNICEF's Secretariat then took the initiative, proposing the terms of reference for an in-depth evaluation. The evaluation was to be conducted by UNICEF's evaluation office, in close consultation with a representative group of member states, and presented to the Executive Board in 1990.

Board members urged more emphasis on the original components of the "GOBI-FFF" strategy (i.e., growth promotion, oral rehydration, breast-feeding, female literacy, family spacing and food supplements) in addition to immunization and oral rehydration activities. The Board encouraged emphasis on the sustainability of UNICEF programs over the longer term.

Recognizing the need for UNICEF Board procedures to keep pace with its expanding program, the Board adopted resolutions on procedures, documentation and the decision-making process as part of an effort to streamline its work. It decided to establish a working group charged with continuing the updating of the rules of procedures and matters related to the organization of the Board. The open-ended working group, subsequently organized under the leadership of Sweden, was to make its recommendations to the Executive Board in 1990.

Finally, in plenary statements, many Board members expressed support for a UNICEF-inspired "World Summit for Children" while others expressed concerns about what such a meeting would accomplish. UNICEF had proposed this global meeting in its annual *State of the World's Children* report for 1989. On the final day of the session, the Secretariat circulated an information note from the Executive Director on the summit proposal. At the time of the Executive Board session, the United States had taken no position regarding the summit proposal, and for this reason, the U.S. Delegation did not address the proposed summit in its interventions.

UNICEF AND THE WORLD SUMMIT FOR CHILDREN

Following the November 1989 decision of the heads of state of Egypt, Mali and Mexico and the heads of government of Canada, Pakistan and Sweden to call a World Summit for Children in September, 1990, the UNICEF Executive Board met in special session, December 18–20, in New York to consider the proposed summit and initiators' request that UNICEF provide the Secretariat for the summit.

The Board's special session endorsed the summit initiative and agreed to UNICEF providing Secretariat support for the preparation of the summit. Sharing the concerns of a number of other members, the U.S. Delegation endorsed the concept of a summit for children that would produce immediate and direct benefits for the children of the world. The United States expressed a willingness to participate in the planning of such a summit; supported the request that UNICEF provide the summit Secretariat, provided its activities and proposed initiatives not be undertaken at the expense of on-going UNICEF programs and activities. The United States also raised questions about the proposed costs of the summit and summit-related activities.

After reviewing budgets for the summit and summit-related mobilization activities, the Board directed UNICEF to prepare a new, better justified, budget with a ceiling of $3.5 million, rather than the initially proposed $5 million amount. After considerable debate regarding the role and relationship of the UNICEF Executive Board and the Summit Planning Committee, the Board adopted a resolution calling for the Board and the Summit Planning Committee to work in close cooperation and consultation in the preparations on the summit. The resolution requested the UNICEF Executive Director to establish special accounts, financed from extrabudgetary resources, for (1) preparation and organization of the summit and (2) summit-related mobilization activities. The

Board also decided to review preparations for the summit at its regular session in April, 1990 and at a subsequent special session to be called later in the year.

UNICEF, in its annual *State of the World's Children* report for 1990 (released on December 12, 1989), cited important achievements in the decade of the 1980s, particularly in the area of health: the proportion of developing-world children immunized has increased from 5 to over 60 percent, with some 1.5 million lives saved and 200,000 cases of polio prevented each year. According to the report, use of low cost ORT, virtually unknown in the developing world at the beginning of the decade, is now used by almost a quarter of the developing-world families and saves almost 2.5 million lives each year. As a consequence, deaths due to diarrheal disease—the major cause of death among children—are declining. The UNICEF report maintained still much remains to be done and stated that a "summit for children" could mobilize the political will to protect and improve the health and well-being of infants, children and mothers.

FUNDING

Contributions to UNICEF are voluntary. In 1989 UNICEF received $329.4 million in voluntary contributions to its general resources from over 110 governments. The U.S. Government contributed $57.4 million, placing it first among the contributors to the general resources budget and accounting for about 17.42 percent of the total contributions. Other major donors, in descending order, included the Governments of Sweden ($44.35 million, 13.55 percent), Italy ($35.44 million, 10.77 percent), Norway ($32.2 million, 9.77 percent), Finland ($27 million, 8.19 percent), Japan ($20.43 million, 6.20 percent), U.S.S.R. ($16 million, 4.86 percent), Denmark ($13.32 million, 4.04 percent), the United Kingdom ($13.03 million, 3.95 percent), Canada ($12.83 million, 3.89 percent), the Netherlands ($12.65 million, 3.84 percent) and Switzerland ($9.94 million, 3.02 percent).

In addition to contributions from governments, UNICEF also receives substantial income from private and other nongovernmental sources. In particular, net income from UNICEF's greeting card and related operations amounted to $49 million, while contributions from other nongovernmental sources amounted to $88 million in 1989.

UNICEF's success in raising funds from these sources is unique in the UN system and is largely due to the fund-raising activities of 34 national committees and UNICEF headquarters-related offices abroad. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a nonprofit organization that has 3 million volunteers throughout all 50 states, is the largest and among the most active of these national committees.

U.S. PRESENCE IN UNICEF

UNICEF has its headquarters in New York. U.S. citizens have held the executive directorship since UNICEF's inception. The current Executive Director is James Grant, a U.S. citizen, who has held this position since January 1, 1980. In

1989 the UN Secretary General reappointed Mr. Grant for a third 5-year term ending on December 31, 1994.

UNICEF employs approximately 1,633 professionals, of whom about 8.1 percent are U.S. citizens. Importantly, U.S. citizens occupy key policy positions, including the executive directorship of UNICEF and the directorships of two out of UNICEF's six regional divisions.

EXPENDITURES IN THE UNITED STATES

In 1989 UNICEF purchased some $21,926,800 in equipment from U.S. suppliers.

Human Settlements Activities

The Commission on Human Settlements (UNCHS) was established in 1977 and consists of 58 members elected for 3-year terms. The Commission provides policy guidance to the Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT) located in Nairobi, Kenya. The United States has been a member since 1977; the permanent U.S. Representative to the Center in Nairobi is also accredited to the UN Environment Program.

The Commission and the Center were created following the UN Conference at Vancouver, Canada, in 1976. They were designed to consolidate existing UN bodies and to provide greater emphasis to human settlements activities. The Center's responsibilities include: coordinating and reviewing all human settlements activities within the UN system; executing projects related to human settlements development; and serving as a focal point for the provision and exchange of information in this area. The Center performs research, conducts training and devises training modules, carries out technical assistance projects for developing countries and provides information on human settlements through studies, reports and audiovisual presentations.

At the end of 1989, HABITAT was implementing some 250 projects in 99 countries with project budgets totaling $112 million. HABITAT also works closely with UNDP; 70 percent of HABITAT funds being UNDP-managed. HABITAT has adopted a Global Shelter Strategy to the Year 2000 to confront the problem of homelessness. The General Assembly of the United Nations endorsed this strategy at its 43rd session.

The last session of the Commission was held in April 1989 in Cartagena, Colombia. The Cartagena UNCHS Conference was officially opened by Colombian President Virgilio Barco on April 24. In his address to the delegates, President Barco emphasized the importance of a housing policy to the government of Colombia and outlined some of the measures Colombia was taking in this area. He also stressed his strong personal interest in housing issues, which dates from his work as a city official in Bogota and Cucuta, and as organizer of the Colombian delegation to the 1976 conference in Vancouver which led to the formation of the UNCHS.

The U.S. Delegation made five formal statements during the course of the Conference. In his opening statement, the Head of the Delegation, Fredrik Hansen, reaffirmed the U.S. Government's commitment to the Global Strategy for Shelter to the Year 2000 (GSSY 2000) and the enabling strategy for shelter development. He also stressed the U.S. Government's view that private sector organizations have a vital role to play in insuring the success of the Global Strategy for Shelter.

The U. S. Delegation also made available to all delegates two written technical submissions—one of these was the U.S. Report on Implementing the Global Shelter Strategy. This report explains how the "National Affordable Housing Act," recently introduced in the U.S. Congress, will help reestablish housing as a major priority on the domestic agenda, and help achieve the goal of providing access to fit, livable and affordable housing for all Americans. The second paper was a technical discussion of the sustainability of urban water supply and sanitation systems.

The major themes on the agenda were the roles and responsibilities of governmental and nongovernmental sectors in the field of human settlements, and the importance of maintenance concerns for sustainable development. The U.S. Delegation was successful in gaining recognition of the vital role played by the private sector in both of these areas.

The delegation announced the 1989 U.S. voluntary contribution of $400,000, bringing the 3-year total to nearly $1.6 million, and making the United States a major contributor to HABITAT.

The Commission on Human Settlements meets every other year; the next meeting being scheduled for 1991 in Harare.

Population Activities

The UN Secretary General established the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in 1967 as a special trust fund. Renamed the UN Population Fund in 1987, it operates under the guidance of ECOSOC. Since 1972 it has been governed directly by the Governing Council of the UN Development Program (UNDP) which provides policy guidance, reviews its program and operations and sets funding and staffing levels. The United States participates in the governance of UNFPA, but has made no contributions since 1986.

Dr. Nafis Sadik of Pakistan, long a senior official of the Fund, assumed the duties of Executive Director in 1987.

UNFPA is second only to the U.S. Government itself as a source of assistance for population activities in developing countries. It had a budget of $194 million in 1989 and finances projects in more than 130 countries. The Fund is working to devote an increasing ratio of its resources to family planning activities per se, to confine its commitment levels to reasonable expectations, and to retain sufficient flexibility so that the assistance will be geared to the circumstances of the recipient country.

In 1985 U.S. AID withheld $10 million of the $46 million that Congress had earmarked for UNFPA after reports surfaced that in the UNFPA-supported family planning program in the People's Republic of China women were forced to obtain abortions or submit to sterilization procedures. Congress then passed the Kemp-Kasten amendment which prohibits U.S. AID from providing assistance to an organization that supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

At that time, the Administrator reviewed the UNFPA program in China and made a determination that UNFPA was ineligible for funding under this restriction. This determination was subsequently upheld in the U.S. courts. No U.S. AID funds were provided for UNFPA in 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989. Funds reserved for UNFPA in these years were reprogrammed into other U.S. AID-funded family planning activities.

U.S. AID continues to reserve funds for UNFPA each year in the event that a significant change in UNFPA's assistance to China or in the Chinese population program itself would make it possible to consider a resumption of U.S. AID support.

In her review of the financial situation of UNFPA, the Executive Director indicated that pledges totaled $180.7 million in 1989, an 8 percent increase over 1988, with 98 donors contributing to the Fund. There was an increase of over 5 percent in the contributions of all major donors along with favorable exchange rates.

Despite the fact that it has made no contribution to UNFPA since 1985, the United States remains an active participant in UNFPA's governance. Consideration of UNFPA items on the agenda of the 36th session of the UNDP Governing Council was marked by overall endorsement of the Fund's leadership and efforts to improve program effectiveness and outreach. The UNFPA expressed satisfaction with the positive and constructive U.S. participation.

The 36th session of the Governing Council reviewed a total of 27 documents. In the plenary session, Council members endorsed documents on the status of financial implementation of Council-approved country programs; the periodic report on evaluation; UNFPA's workplan for 1990–1993; and the UNFPA's strategy for office automation.

The United States cited a number of examples of complementary and well-coordinated efforts between UNFPA and U.S. AID in such areas as provision of contraceptive commodities, data collection and analysis, population awareness-raising and policy planning and implementation.

During the day and a half of the Committee of the Whole, 13 new multi-year country programs were reviewed and approved by consensus, including: Algeria, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, El Salvador, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Panama, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo, Zimbabwe and the $57 million, 5-year program for China. In the case of China, the United States disassociated itself from the approval of the country program. In a statement read by U.S. AID Assistant Administrator Nyle Brady said the United States strongly opposed the program as currently formulated and dissociated itself unequivocally from any interpretation of the Council's consensus that would suggest U.S. approval of the family planning program in China.

The World Food Council

The UN General Assembly created the World Food Council (WFC) pursuant to resolution 22 of the 1974 World Food Conference. The Council offers advice and recommendations on world food and agricultural problems and related policy issues. The WFC performs this function primarily through its annual ministerial session. The Council is composed of 36 member states, representing various regions of the world, which are nominated by the ECOSOC and elected by the General Assembly. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have been members of the WFC continuously since its establishment. The Executive Director of the WFC Secretariat is Gerald Trant (Canada). The WFC Secretariat has a staff of 10 professionals, of whom 2 are Americans. The 1988–1989 biennium budget was $4.8 million.

The WFC held its 15th ministerial session in Cairo, Egypt, May 22–25. The U.S. Delegation to the meeting was headed by Dr. Richard T. Crowder, USDA Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs. Egyptian Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture Youssef Wally was elected president for the 1990–1991 term.

The plenary sessions were devoted to interventions by delegations in response to the "Cyprus Initiative" developed at the 1988 ministerial meeting. Almost all delegations agreed that hunger and malnutrition are generally not caused by food shortages but rather by poverty and problems of distribution. In the U.S. intervention, Under Secretary Crowder asked "all council members to take stock of their own national efforts to end hunger and set an example by putting them in order." Crowder concluded by saying "each of us must show the political will to overcome the economic and social barriers that have left so many poor and hungry. Each nation is responsible; each nation must act."

The "Cairo Declaration" issued by the ministerial calls on nations to make the elimination of hunger and poverty a central objective of national policies. It asks international organizations and nations to create integrated food strategies aimed at achieving the sustainable reduction of hunger and malnutrition and increased food self-reliance. During 1989 the WFC Secretariat brought the Cairo Declaration to the attention of many international organizations and also made plans to hold regional meetings to discuss specific measures countries are taking to fight hunger and malnutrition.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Crime Prevention and Control

During 1989, preparations were carried out for the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders to be held in 1990. The first regular session of ECOSOC thus passed a number of resolutions in the field of crime prevention and control. ECOSOC rejected a U.S. Government resolution recommending Vienna as the site for the 1990 Congress. Instead, ECOSOC accepted the invitation of the Cuban Government and chose Havana as the site in 1990. The U.S. Delegation stated that the United States would not participate because of the extensive allegations of human rights violations in Cuba, allegations of drug trafficking and assistance to hijackers.

ECOSOC resolution 1989/58 encouraged the further appointment of national correspondents in the field of crime prevention and control and requested the Secretary General to report on the implementation of this resolution to the next session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. Resolution 1989/59 requested the Secretary General to issue special UN postage stamps on the occasion of the Eighth Congress and place the revenues earned at the disposal of the African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.

Resolution 1989/62 encouraged concerted international actions against the forms of crime identified in the Milan Plan of Action (i.e., organized crime, illicit drug trafficking and criminal acts of a terrorist nature). Resolution 1989/63 concerned the implementation of UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice. It requested the Secretary General to formulate proposals on this subject for the Eighth Congress and emphasized the need to strengthen the role of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control.

Resolution 1989/68, entitled "Review of the functioning and program of work of the United Nations in crime prevention and criminal justice," lengthened the session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to be held before the Eighth Congress and authorized the chairman of the

Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to convene intersessional working groups as necessary to consider priority issues of concern to member states. "Continuation of preparations for the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders" was adopted as resolution 1989/69. This resolution, *inter alia,* set the dates for the Eighth Congress as August 27 through September 7, 1990, and recommended various topics to be addressed by the Congress.

The 44th session of the UN General Assembly adopted without a vote two resolutions on this subject. Resolution 44/71 requested the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to give special attention to improvement of international cooperation in combatting organized crime, and resolution 44/72 was a general exhortation to continue UN efforts in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice.

Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

The 10th biennial session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control was held in Vienna, August 22–31, 1988. The next session is scheduled for 1990, to be held prior to the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, to be convened in Havana, Cuba, August 27 through September 7, 1990.

Drug Abuse Control

During 1989 the United States continued to utilize the UN system to pursue key international drug control goals. Heightened drug control activities at the 1989 UN General Assembly and in other UN fora were evidence of the high priority that drug control continued to receive within the United Nations and among its member states.

In an effort to assist and express solidarity with the Colombians and to give impetus to the worldwide fight against the violence and other negative results of illicit narcotic activities, the 44th General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for a special session on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, to be held February 20–23, 1990, in New York. Other multilateral drug control activities focused on encouraging rapid ratification of the 1988 drug trafficking convention and continuing followup to the recommendations of the UN's June 1987 International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT).

To assure the success of the new convention and to continue progress on other drug control endeavors, the United States worked diligently in several different UN fora. During 1989, in addition to the customary meetings, international narcotics control issues were discussed by Security Council members and in the joint meetings of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) and the Committee on Program Coordination (CPC). The United States continued to concentrate on working through the three UN intergovernmental bodies most involved in drug control activities—the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the UN General Assembly.

The United States also worked closely with the UN Secretariat to obtain additional UN regular budget resources for the UN Division of Narcotic Drugs and the Secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board. In addition, the United States worked with UN member states from all regions to promote rapid ratification of the new convention and to ensure that UN drug control program activities, at the country level, continued to gain wide support.

During 1989 contributions increased substantially for the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), a voluntary fund established in 1971 largely through United States efforts. An American continued to serve as UNFDAC Deputy Director and, as elsewhere in the UN system, efforts continued to ensure the employment of U.S. citizens at appropriate levels in the drug agencies.

UN DRUG CONTROL AGENCIES

Ms. Margaret Joan Anstee (United Kingdom) continued as Coordinator of UN Drug-Related Activities, while serving as Director General of the UN Office at Vienna. She was responsible for overseeing and coordinating the major issues related to the UN drug agencies.

Division of Narcotic Drugs

The UN Division of Narcotic Drugs (DND) Programs emphasized practical technical and scientific assistance to member states. In addition, the DND worked extensively with experts from the United States to develop the International Drug Abuse Assessment System (IDAAS), a U.S. initiative made possible by a special 1988 contribution from the United States. This system will enable the Division to analyze drug abuse data at national, regional and international levels and will facilitate worldwide cooperation in this area. Francisco Ramos-Galino (Spain) continued to serve as the DND Director. During the CND session, the Division received praise for its work on the 1988 Vienna drug trafficking convention.

UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control

The UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), under the leadership of Executive Director Guiseppe Di Gennaro (Italy), continued to expand its program activities during 1989. A total of 152 technical cooperation projects were undertaken in 49 countries. The growth in financial resources from voluntary contributions enabled UNFDAC to enlarge its programs worldwide. Activities were focused on reducing the supply of and demand for illicit narcotics, strengthening drug control measures, including law enforcement and research. The majority of UNFDAC's projects were concentrated in the major producing countries in Asia and Africa. A portion of the U.S. pledge was to support the establishment of specialized courts in Bolivia.

As a demonstration of government endorsement of UNFDAC and its work, 59 countries pledged and/or contributed $49.9 million in 1989. Some of it was intended for implementation in future years. The United States pledged $2 million. According to UNFDAC estimates, the Fund spent approximately $43.2 million in 1989. These moneys went for crop replacement/agricultural development, in narcotics producing regions, research and drug law enforcement, preventive education and information and treatment and rehabilitation of drug dependent persons. The United States continued to play a leadership role in guiding the work of the Fund. During 1989, the United States expressed interest in increasing its future contributions to UNFDAC in return for performance-based results.

International Narcotics Control Board

The 1989 report of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) offered an assessment of the general trends in trafficking, abuse and licit and illicit production. The 1989 report stressed the threat that drug trafficking presents to national security and urged nations to increase cooperation to find traffickers and bring them to justice. It emphasized the role that the new drug trafficking convention has to play in this area and therefore the importance of states provisionally applying the terms of the new treaty. U.S. officials were pleased that the Board rejected legalization of illicit narcotics. As the Board stated, slackening of the control effort is ". . . morally indefensible and tantamount to the surrender of the world community to drug cartels."

In addition, the Board pointed out the need for consuming countries to increase demand reduction activities and for producing countries to take stronger steps to decrease illicitly cultivated narcotics-producing plants. In this vein, the Board stressed the multifacted nature of the problem and the need for members of the international community to deal with all its aspects. The United States is pleased that the Board recommended better data on illicit cultivation and increased access to modern reconnaisance technology to permit location and destruction of illicit cultivation. It also urged greater attention to the negative effects to the environment of illicit coca cultivation, particularly the damaging effects to water systems.

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

The 33rd session of the 40-member Commission on Narcotic Drugs convened in Vienna from February 6 to 17. Ambassador Michael Newlin led the U.S. Delegation, which included representatives of the Departments of State, Justice (including the Drug Enforcement Administration), Health and

Human Services, Transportation (U.S. Coast Guard) and Treasury (the U.S. Customs Service). The CND approved six draft resolutions and five draft decisions which were forwarded for ECOSOC consideration, as well as four resolutions and three decisions which did not require ECOSOC action.

Members in 1989 were: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Ecuador, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, U.S.S.R., Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia (Terms expire December 1989). Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Cote d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, France, India, Italy, Lebanon, Madagascar, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia (Terms expire December 1991).

An on-going responsibility of the CND is to place narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances under the international control provisions of the two international drug control conventions. In 1989 the CND voted for control of buprenorphine (21-cyclo-propyl-7a-((S)-1-hydroxy-1,2,2- trimethylpropyl)-6,14-endo-ethano-6,7,8,14-tetrahydrooripavine) in Schedule III of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and of pemoline (2-amino-5-phenyl-2-oxazolin-4-one and 2-imino-5-phenyl-4-oxazolidinone) in Schedule IV of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971. The U.S. Delegation supported each approved decision.

A CND resolution proposed by the U.S. Delegation, supporting the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control and its activities, was adopted by consensus. This measure reaffirmed the three basic drug-related treaties (i.e., the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances and the 1988 drug trafficking convention), and made clear that the 1988 convention did not detract from the 1961 or 1971 conventions. The resolution also linked the Fund's activities to all three conventions and specified a role for the INCB in monitoring projects funded by the UNFDAC so as to ensure that the aims of the drug control conventions were protected.

ECOSOC CONSIDERATION

At the ECOSOC, which met in May, eight draft resolutions and six draft decisions concerning drug control were approved. Included in the drafts were calls for rapid ratification and provisional implementation of the new drug trafficking convention, increased attention to implementation of the recommendations of the 1987 International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking, identification of means to resolve the problem of excess stocks of opiates, provision of high priority and resources for the UN drug bodies and increased contributions to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

The United States sponsored the resolution on provisional application of the drug trafficking convention. This resolution reflected the importance the United States placed on the convention and the belief that countries should apply its provisions on a voluntary basis pending ratification by states and entry into force. The resolution had broad support, with sponsors from 32 countries, including all five Permanent Members of the Security Council, and was adopted by consensus on May 22.

Most of the statements made during the ECOSOC debate expressed concern about the ill effects of drug abuse and illicit trafficking and noted the importance of the United Nations playing a strong role to combat the problem. Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne said, "Despite the international community's achievements, much more remains to be done. The United Nations has been and should continue to be a major participant." She stressed that in order to maintain the momentum acquired and to keep moving forward, more resources, time and energy had to be committed to the work of the United Nations in narcotics control.

Elections were held to fill seats on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board. The following 20 members were elected to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for 4-year terms beginning January 1, 1990: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Gambia, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom.

For the International Narcotics Control Board to fill a vacancy created by the death of an incumbent member, John C. Ebie (Nigeria), Manuel Quijano Narezo (Mexico) was elected with the term to expire March 1, 1990. Also elected to the Board were Cai Zhi-Ji (China), H. Cajias Kauffmann (Bolivia), O. Schroeder (Federal Republic of Germany), A.M. Mansour (Egypt), M.V.N. Rao (India) and M. Kchouk (Tunisia). Ms. Betty Gough of the United States continued to serve on the Board.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Discussion of international narcotics control issues at the 44th UN General Assembly included many new ideas and proposals, and added impetus to the growing fight against the scourge of drug abuse and its related ill effects. Several resolutions were adopted which called on the UN system and its member states to increase activities in the area of international narcotics control. Signaling the high level of international interest, the Assembly gave Colombian President Barco a standing ovation for his moving speech. Barco stressed the economic importance of drug trafficking to the people of producing countries and endorsed the call for a UN special session on drugs.

President Bush, in his address to the UN General Assembly said that illegal drugs are a menace to social order and a source of human misery wherever they gain a foothold. The nations who suffer this scourge must join forces in the fight. He emphasized the importance of states ratifying and implementing the new drug trafficking convention.

The tone of discussions in the Third Committtee was conciliatory and stressed the urgent need for coordinated, international action. In his address before the Third Committee, Melvyn Levitsky, Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics Matters, said:

> We are at a critical period in our collective efforts to reduce the demand for drugs, paralyze drug trafficking organizations and curb the illicit production of narcotics. Nations have joined together as never before in the global commitment to eliminate the narcotics threat. Many nations depend on the support that the United Nations and its drug agencies provide.

Mr. Levitsky stressed the need for providing additional resources to the drug agencies from the UN regular budget. He outlined areas which the United States believed should be the focus of the UN special session. These included assisting countries faced by increasing illicit production and trafficking to strengthen their judicial and policy systems.

The many new initiatives and proposals resulted in three resolutions which were adopted by the plenary by consensus:

— UN General Assembly resolution 44/140 called for rapid ratification and implementation of the 1988 drug trafficking convention;

— UN General Assembly resolution 44/141, entitled Global Program of Action, called for a system-wide plan of action on drug abuse control activities, a Global Program of Action outlining new substantive drug control activities and a study of ways to strengthen the UN drug control effort, indicating possible structural alternatives.

— UN General Assembly resolution 44/142, called upon member states to take various actions to stop drug abuse and upon the Secretary General to prepare a study of the economic and social consequences of illicit trafficking.

Global Program of Action

The United States joined with the Swedish Delegation in drafting resolution 44/141 on the Global Program of Action. A major segment of this resolution called on the ACC to take steps to coordinate the work of the UN system in narcotics control. The United States originally introduced this idea in the ACC/CPC session of October 17.

The Delegate from the United States, John S. Wolf, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, argued that the UN system should adopt the "Unitary UN" concept, which would ensure that all agencies worked in a cohesive and coordinated way. He noted that the UN system is in a unique position to make a positive impact on transnational issues, such as drugs. Regarding the "Unitary UN," Mr. Wolf stated:

> The fight against drug abuse and trafficking is an ideal field for such a concept to be implemented. The UN drug agencies need to operate from a position of strength. The Secretary General himself has stated his support for a stronger and more effective UN

response to the drug problem. Adequate coordination among the Division of Narcotic Drugs, the International Narcotics Control Board, and the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control, is critical in formulating effective worldwide narcotics control activities.

Mr. Wolf asked that the United Nations and its specialized agencies, through the ACC, develop a coordinated and concrete plan of action on narcotics control. He said that the United States would introduce a resolution at the 44th General Assembly giving the ACC a new mandate in this field.

The report of the joint ACC/CPC session reaffirmed the importance of enhanced cooperation, particularly in the areas of prevention and reduction of demand, control of supply, suppression of illicit trafficking and treatment and rehabilitation. The conclusions recommended that the ACC prepare a system-wide plan of action on international narcotics control and asked the organizations of the UN system to prepare a report on current activities in this field.

Subsequently, the General Assembly resolution asked the ACC to report on the implementation of these recommendations to the 25th series of joint meetings in 1990. The resolution specified that this strategy include a statement of objective or purpose; concrete actions that each agency should undertake, ensuring no duplication with the work of other agencies, using the recommendations from the 1987 Conference as a general guide; a reasonable time-line for implementation of each recommendation; a proposed date for full implementation of each portion of the program; and a realistic cost estimate for implementing the program.

Another section of resolution 44/141 requested the General Assembly to consider a number of substantive ideas at its special session, for possible inclusion in the Global Program of Action. This list included intensification of rehabilitative, legal and preventive measures, including public information and education; declaration of a UN decade against drug abuse; support for rural and other economic and judicial development programs through the strengthening of economic, judicial and legal systems; measures to counteract negative economic and social consequences of the drug problem, with the full involvement of financial institutions; prevention of use of the banking system for processing or laundering of drug-related moneys; ways to enhance the efficiency of the UN structure for drug abuse control; generation of increased financial resources for the UN drug effort; expansion of training for national narcotics agents; establishment of a reserve pool of experienced narcotics agents whose services states might request; establishment of a UN facility to gather information on financial flows from drug-related funds; and a UN capability to provide training and equipment for anti-drug operations.

Special Session on Narcotics

In an effort to give support to the critical and violent situation in Colombia, the U.K. Mission to the United Nations, with support from the United States, proposed a UN Security Council resolution. This measure supported Colombian efforts to control narcotics traffickers and to link the drug trade with the threat to international peace and security. The resolution was intended to give other member states an opportunity to express solidarity with and concern for the aggravated situation in Colombia.

The Brazilians, however, believed that the Security Council was not the appropriate forum for discussion of the drug issue, which has broad interest in the world community. They argued that, because of the limited membership of the Security Council, many UN members with serious drug problems would be precluded from participating. Instead, the Brazilians suggested convening a special session of the General Assembly to discuss narcotics issues.

Brazil then proposed inscription of an item entitled "Special Session of the General Assembly to Consider the Question of International Cooperation Against Illicit Production, Supply, Demand, Trafficking and Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, with a view to Expanding the Scope and Increasing the Effectiveness of such Cooperation." Brazil argued that such a session was important because of the seriousness of the problem and the need for concerted action by the international community. Convening this session would be a decisive call for action.

On November 3 the General Assembly adopted by consensus a draft resolution, with 123 cosponsors including the United States, calling for a special session on narcotics. It was agreed that the session would be preceded by two preparatory committee meetings (December 6–7, 1989, and February 12–14, 1990) and that the session itself would be held from February 20–23, 1990, in New York City.

The first preparatory committee meeting established the rules of procedure and considered the agenda for the special session. Ambassador Alexander F. Watson, U.S. Alternate Representative to the First Preparatory Committee, stressed the importance of having the special session focus on substance and existing mandates, including the recently passed Third Committee resolutions and the new drug trafficking convention:

> I believe we must seize this opportunity to transform our words and the initiatives we have adopted into tangible goals if we are truly committed to strengthening the collective response to the international drug problem, in its entirety. . . . We must not lose sight of the fact that we have tasked ourselves with building a cooperative, collective program of action to deal with drug abuse, drug production and trafficking. We need the UN system to complement our national and regional anti-narcotics strategies. Therefore, we must use the special session to refine and strengthen the multilateral drug control effort.

The meeting agreed that the basis for discussions at the special session would include the three existing conventions, bilateral and regional legal arrangements, resolutions adopted at the 44th General Assembly on narcotics control, activities of the three UN drug agencies and the Recommendations and Comprehensive

Multidisciplinary Outline from the 1987 International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking. The result of the session would be the adoption of a political declaration and a Global Program of Action.

Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator

Problems of uncoordinated relief efforts in a series of major disasters in the late 1960s convinced members of the United Nations that a distinct office was needed to help organize the emergency assistance that individual governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross and other voluntary organizations provide. In March 1972 the UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO), subsequently renamed the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, was established to mobilize relief more rapidly; coordinate it more systematically; and reduce waste, duplication and failure in the supply of essential items. UNDRO was also given responsibility for improving contingency planning and disaster preparedness worldwide and for harnessing modern, scientific and technological knowledge to prevent and mitigate disasters.

UNDRO's mandate is three-fold: to mobilize, direct and coordinate relief activities among organizations of the UN system; to assist governments of stricken countries to assess relief needs, disseminate that information and coordinate the donors' response; and to promote disaster prevention and preparedness activities. Disaster relief coordination is the core of the activities of UNDRO and receives the highest priority in the allocation of resources.

The Geneva-based organization is headed by the UNDRO Coordinator, who holds the rank of Under-Secretary General and reports directly to the UN Secretary General. The UNDRO Coordinator's term normally is coterminous with that of the UN Secretary General. The current UNDRO Coordinator is M'hamed Essaafi of Tunisia. UNDRO also maintains a liaison office in New York.

UNDRO does not have a governing body, and thus it has no formal meetings per se. UNDRO matters are discussed biennially in ECOSOC. They were discussed at the 1988 ECOSOC summer session and at the 43rd General Assembly.

UNDRO receives funding through the regular UN budget of which the United States is assessed 25 percent. For the 1988–1989 biennium, UNDRO was allocated $7 million by the United Nations. Over the last decade, the United States also contributed over $1 million of disaster relief assistance through UNDRO to countries such as Ethiopia, Chad and Bangladesh.

For many years, the United States was a major source of voluntary funding for UNDRO, but the United States in the 1980s stopped contributing to the trust fund to "strengthen" UNDRO because UNDRO was experiencing problems that resulted in a serious decline in its effectiveness.

REFORM OF UNDRO

In response to assessments that UNDRO was not fulfilling its primary mission of coordinating UN assistance in disaster relief operations, a UN study in 1986 recommended that the UN Development Program (UNDP) take over UNDRO's functions. The UN Secretary General elected instead to retain UNDRO as a separate entity and established a joint UNDP/UNDRO task force to make recommendations for closer cooperation.

In 1988 the task force submitted its report to the General Assembly. The United States supported the report, which included a series of specific steps intended to improve UN performance in disaster-related matters.

UNDRO has been working with UNDP to implement the recommendations of the task force both at the headquarters and field levels. At the headquarters level, work began on a joint UNDRO/UNDP disaster management manual and joint training programs in disaster management are being developed. At the field level, the UNDP Resident Representative has been designated as the in-country focal point for disaster-related activities concerned with relief operations, prevention, mitigation as well as preparedness plans and programs.

The United States met with members of the joint UNDRO/UNDP task force considering ways to further strengthen UNDRO/UNDP cooperation in times of disasters, as well as the UN system response in assisting disaster-prone countries in disaster mitigation activities, and in strengthening disaster management capabilities within countries.

UNDRO ACTIVITIES IN 1989

Throughout the year under review, UNDRO was involved in relief and assistance activities in many areas, including:

— Angola, Mozambique, Lebanon, Mauritania, Senegal, Sudan, Romania (armed conflict, civil strife, famine, and/or returnees and displaced persons);

— Algeria, China, Malawi, U.S.S.R. (earthquakes);

— China (hailstorms);

— Guyana, the Caribbean, Zambia (hurricanes and heavy rains);

— China, Mauritius (typhoons and cyclones);

— Burundi, Djibouti, Malawi, Tanzania, Yemen (floods);

— Mozambique (drought); and

— Ethiopia (meningitis outbreak).

UNDRO cooperates closely with many organizations in the UN system and other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations involved in humanitarian relief. For example, the northern regions of Ethiopia, beset by massive drought since 1984, continues to be an area of serious concern for UN agencies. UNDRO has worked with donors and other UN agencies in efforts to meet the food needs of some 3 million Ethiopians in the region.

In the area of disaster preparedness and prevention, UNDRO participated in and cosponsored studies, seminars, missions and projects concerning, *inter alia*, seismic risk reduction, disaster mitigation, information systems development, tropical cyclones, mudflow prevention and disaster management training. Representatives from U.S. disaster relief services participated in a January 1989 joint UNDRO/WHO/PAHO Seminar on Disaster Preparedness and Response in Latin American and the Caribbean entitled "The Role of the Health sector and NGOs in the UN Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR).

NATIONAL EMERGENCY RELIEF SERVICES III

In October 1989 UNDRO hosted the third meeting of Officials in Charge of National Emergency Relief Services (NERS-III) which was attended by representatives from over 18 donor countries and 6 UN agencies. The U.S. Delegation was headed by the Director of the Agency for International Development's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, Andrew S. Natsios. During the session, the U.S. Delegation offered to provide U.S. Government relief specialists to UNDRO for short periods to assist in the coordination of disaster relief; emphasized the need for standard damage and needs assessment formats to reduce conflicts among major relief agencies and governments; and, after noting that the U.S. Government responds on a bilateral basis in close cooperation with UNDRO and other donors, encouraged standardization of procedures.

A number of recommendations resulted from the meeting, including, *inter alia*, that, given UNDRO's limited staff, donor governments continue to offer services of national relief experts on stand-by to assist UNDRO in conducting field assessments of damage and relief needs; and that UNDRO hold workshops for heads of search and rescue teams for the purpose of sharing experiences and defining standards of operations methods and equipment. In this regard, the United States offered to cooperate with UNDRO, Japan and other countries in developing a search and rescue workshop in a given developing country in order to develop standards for search and rescue teams.

INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR NATURAL DISASTER REDUCTION

In response to a December 1988 General Assembly resolution designating the 1990s as a decade in which the international community will devote special attention to the goal of reducing natural disasters (Resolution 42/169), the ECOSOC at its summer 1989 session received a report of the UN Secretary General (A/44/322 and E/1989/114) covering the report of an *ad hoc* group of experts appointed by the UN Secretary General to make recommendations on implementation and organizational structure for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR).

On December 11 the UN General Assembly in adopting resolution 44/236 proclaimed the IDNDR, beginning on January 1, 1990; designated the second Wednesday of October as an International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction; and adopted the International Framework for Action for the IDNDR, along the lines proposed by the expert group. The United States cosponsored the resolution on the Decade, a proposal initiated by Dr. Frank Press, President of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, who had also chaired the expert group.

UN High Commissioner For Refugees

The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), organized in 1951, is mandated to provide legal protection and material assistance to refugees and to promote permanent solutions for refugee problems. These responsibilities are carried out on behalf of refugees falling within the scope of the Statute of the Office adopted by the General Assembly in 1950. In general, the Statute applies to those persons who are outside their country of nationality because they have a well-founded fear of persecution by reason of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and, because of such fear, are unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the government of that country. The term of the current High Commissioner, Thorvald Stoltenberg (Norway), expires December 31, 1993.

The Executive Committee of the UNHCR meets annually in Geneva to review the work of the UNHCR and approve the budget. At this meeting, the UNHCR advises the Executive Committee on any special activities. The U.S. Representative at the 40th session of the Executive Committee, held October 2–13, was Ambassador Jewel Lafontant, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PROTECTION

The basic legal mechanisms for the protection of refugees are the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which is restricted to persons who became refugees as a result of events occurring before 1951, and the 1967 Protocol, which removes the time limit on eligibility. The United States is a party to the Protocol. States acceding to these international instruments accept provisions explicitly prohibiting the return of a refugee, in any manner whatsoever, to any country in which his life or freedom would be threatened because of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion. At the same time, however, the refugee has obligations to the country in which he finds himself and is required to conform to its laws and regulations as well as to the measures taken for the maintenance of public order.

The international protection of refugees includes ensuring that they are granted (political) asylum, that those who wish to return voluntarily to their country of origin may do so without penalty for having fled, and that no refugee is forcibly returned to his/her country of origin. The UNHCR also is concerned with providing basic care and maintenance for refugees, including meeting emergency needs, and with protecting the refugees' right to work, to practice their religion and to receive social benefits under the law.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Eleven resolutions on refugee-related matters were introduced in the Third Committee; eight were related to refugees in Africa, one each to refugees in Asia and Central America, and one to the Office of the High Commissioner. All 11 were adopted without a vote: "International Conference on the Plight of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in Southern Africa" (Resolution 44/136); "Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees" (Resolution 44/137); "International Conference on Indo-Chinese Refugees" (Resolution 44/138); "International Conference on Central American Refugees" (Resolution 44/139); "Assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Malawi" (Resolution 44/149); "Humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Djibouti" (Resolution 44/150); "Situation of refugees in the Sudan" (Resolution 44/151); "Assistance to refugees in Somalia" (Resolution 44/152); "Assistance to voluntary returnees and displaced persons in Chad" (Resolution 44/153); "Assistance to refugees and returnees in Ethiopia" (Resolution 44/154); and "Assistance to student refugees in southern Africa" (Resolution 44/157).

Resolution 44/136, "International Conference on the Plight of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in Southern Africa," was adopted without a vote, but the United States did not participate because it felt that the resolution does not adequately reflect events that have occurred in the past year.

Discrepancies include the phrase "constant deterioration of the situation" (preambular paragraph 2), allegations of "acts of aggression and destabilization" (preambular paragraphs 4 and 6) and the assertion that the South African Government was the main cause of refugee flows and displacement during the period addressed by the resolution.

In addition to these resolutions, the United States was in support of the General Assembly decision to elect Thorvald Stoltenberg as UN High

Commissioner for Refugees for a 4-year term of office beginning on January 1, 1990, and ending on December 31, 1993.

In her statement before the Third Committee, the U.S. Representative to the Third Committee, Ambassador Jewel Lafontant, called upon the international community to renew its commitment to refugees, citing in particular the budgetary situation facing the UNHCR in 1989. As contributions from traditional sources have failed to keep pace with increasing needs, Ambassador Lafontant stated that the High Commissioner must take the lead in finding new sources of funds, such as nontraditional donor governments and the private sector. Ambassador Lafontant then praised UNHCR for its work in upholding the principle of first asylum and promoting voluntary repatriation and other durable solutions, and pledged full U.S. support for the working group established in October 1989 to review UNHCR's programs and make recommendations for future action.

UNHCR PROGRAMS

UNHCR's worldwide expenditures in 1989 totaled $572.6 million. This total included $140.5 million for General Program overall allocations and multi-regional elements of the Special Appeals which are not reflected in the expenditures indicated below by geographic region. The United States contributed $125.8 million in support of UNHCR calendar year 1989 assistance programs worldwide.

Africa

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Africa totaled $205.4 million in 1989; $168.4 million under General Programs and $37.0 million under Special Programs. UNHCR continued to coordinate the major international relief programs in Malawi, Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan. In 1989 significant numbers of refugees on the continent repatriated, including Mozambicans, Burundians, Angolans and Zaireans, and UNHCR was able to successfully bring to a close its programs of return for Ugandans and Namibians. However, large and growing problems remained in the form of continued fighting, drought and new influxes. The number of Mozambicans in Malawi had risen dramatically to 823,000 by year's end; physical conditions in eastern Ethiopia continued to make the delivery of even emergency provisions difficult; and budget constraints limited UNHCR's ability to preposition relief supplies in the Sudan. In addition, UNHCR will have to respond to the needs of over 140,000 Liberian refugees who fled the fighting which broke out in December. In 1989 U.S. contributions to UNHCR programs throughout the region totaled $64.4 million.

Asia

In 1989 UNHCR programs to assist refugees in Asia totaled $70.2 million; $66.3 million under the General Program and $3.9 million under the Special Program. The United States contributed $20.5 million.

At the end of 1989, the region-wide population in UNHCR camps was 202,088, including 116,117 Vietnamese, 68,741 Laotians and 17,230 Cambodians. While some Vietnamese and a record number of Laotians repatriated voluntarily in 1989, large-scale influxes throughout the region continued. In June, for example, the number of Vietnamese arriving in Hong Kong had reached 1,000 per day. As these new outflows placed increasing pressure on first asylum, the International Conference on Indochinese Refugees was convened in Geneva, June 13–14. The conference adopted the Comprehensive Plan of Action (CPA), which focuses on the Vietnamese asylum-seekers and deals with problems of regular and clandestine departure, reception of new arrivals, status determination, resettlement and voluntary repatriation. The CPA is designed to preserve first asylum in the region while limiting resettlement to bona fide refugees whose status is determined based on international standards. At the end of 1989, status determination procedures were in place in Hong Kong, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaysia. For those determined not to be refugees, voluntary repatriation was being encouraged.

Another element of the CPA is its emphasis on legal means of departure. In 1989, 43,179 Vietnamese emigrated legally through the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), the largest single year figure to date.

In addition to its role in implementing the CPA, UNHCR, as the lead agency in the Cambodian repatriation, began planning for the repatriation of over 300,000 Cambodians displaced in Thailand within the framework of a comprehensive political settlement. Finally, in 1989 the United States contributed $1,085,600 in support of the UNHCR and Royal Thai Government cooperative plan to combat pirate attacks on Vietnamese boat refugees in the Gulf of Thailand and for other rescue-at-sea activities and $250,000 in support of the UNHCR special Lao screening program.

Europe and North America

In 1989 UNHCR programs to assist refugees in Europe and North America totaled $17.8 million. In 1989, asylum applications throughout Europe and North America continued to increase, with the single largest influx occurring in the Federal Republic of Germany. As the nations of Eastern Europe began their dramatic moves toward democracy and liberalization, UNHCR prepared to play an even greater positive role on behalf of refugees and asylum-seekers in Europe. In 1989 UNHCR programs in Europe were designed primarily to assist refugees in transit and those refugees who were awaiting repatriation or permanent resettlement. UNHCR assistance activities in North America were primarily related to counseling services on legal and resettlement issues. In 1989 the United States contributed $500,000 toward UNHCR's $1.4 million local integration program in Hungary, the only Eastern European country besides Yugoslavia to accede to the convention and protocol.

Latin America

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Latin America totaled $34.2 million in 1989, with its largest programs in Honduras, Mexico and Costa Rica. In order to ensure the continuance of protection and assistance activities and to further pursue durable solutions in the region, the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA) was convened in Guatemala City from May 29 to 31. The conference adopted the "Declaration and Concerted Plan of Action in favor of Central American Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons," which puts forward an action program stressing the close relationship between reintegration of these target groups (nearly two million according to some estimates), the regional peace process and national development efforts. The plan calls on governments to respect the rights of refugees to repatriate voluntarily, and, where conditions are not conducive to return, to work toward creating such conditions. Efforts should be made to ensure that refugees unable to repatriate are permitted to play meaningful roles in their countries of asylum.

Other important developments in the region were the large-scale repatriations of some 3,000 Salvadoran refugees in the last 3 months of the year under UNHCR auspices and the preparations being made for the return of 8,000 more to their country of origin. Almost 2,000 Nicaraguan Miskito Indians repatriated from Honduras and some 1,000 Guatemalans returned home from Mexico, but these numbers fell far short of earlier predictions. For the year, U.S. contributions in support of UNHCR programs throughout the region totaled $9.8 million.

Southwest Asia, North Africa and the Middle East

In 1989 UNHCR expenditures for programs in this region totaled $70.2 million. At the end of the year, an estimated 40,000 Mauritanians who fled the outbreak of fighting remained in Senegal. While relief to these refugees had moved out of the emergency phase, UNHCR continued to play a major role in the provision of assistance.

The largest program in the region, the relief effort for over three million Afghans in Pakistan, provides food, shelter, health services, education and vocational training for the largest refugee population in the world. UNHCR is the lead agency in this major international relief program which supports the Government of Pakistan's efforts to meet the basic needs of these refugees. In recent years, UNHCR has focused attention on increasing the Afghans' self-sufficiency as a means of preparing them for eventual repatriation. UNHCR's activities include projects designed to provide refugees with employment opportunities, thus freeing them from dependency on camp life in an asylum country. UNHCR's protection efforts have been focused on gaining access to detained refugees, prescreening groups with particular security concerns and monitoring new arrivals.

In addition, UNHCR continued to work closely with the Office of the UN Special Coordinator for Afghanistan, which was created in 1988 to coordinate and implement a program for rehabilitation and reconstruction in preparation for the expected repatriation of millions of Afghan refugees currently outside of Afghanistan and for those who were displaced inside Afghanistan. Since 1980 the United States has contributed over $216 million to UNHCR for its Afghan refugee assistance program in Pakistan and over $19 million to UNOCA. In 1989 the U.S. contribution toward UNHCR's activities in Pakistan totaled $19.9 million. In addition, the United States contributed $10 million in support of the UNHCR program in Cyprus.

Social Development

WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION

In accordance with resolution 40/100, the UN General Assembly received the Secretary General's report on the World Social Situation. The UN Assembly adopted resolution 44/56, "World social situation," by a vote of 131 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. The resolution, submitted by Malaysia, supported the Declaration on Social Progress and Development, which the United States considers outdated, and contained unacceptable language. U.S. efforts to modify the text of the resolution were unsuccessful. Our Western allies abstained.

Three other resolutions concerning the world social situation were presented to the 44th UN General Assembly and adopted without a vote: "Popular participation in its various forms as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights" (44/53), "Social welfare, development and science and technology" (Resolution 44/54), and "Achievement of social justice." (Resolution 44/55.)

AGING AND ELDERLY

The United States considers the aging issue to be one of the most important issues in the UN social affairs field. At the 44th session of the UN General Assembly, the United States joined consensus on a resolution entitled "Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Aging and related activities." (Resolution 44/67.) The resolution directed the Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs to prepare a global program of activities for 1992 to mark the 10th anniversary of the World Assembly on Aging and called for increased cooperation among member states, the UN system, and nongovernmental organizations in efforts to increase awareness of the needs of the elderly.

DISABLED

The United States supports UN programs for the disabled and traditionally cosponsors a resolution on the disabled. At the 44th session of the UN General

Assembly, the United States cosponsored resolution 44/70, "Implementation of the World Program of Action concerning Disabled Persons and the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons." The resolution, adopted without a vote, urged member states to submit to the Secretary General comments on alternative ways to mark the end of the Decade in 1992. The Tallinn Guidelines for Action on Human Resources Development in the Field of Disability were attached as an annex to the resolution.

YOUTH

The 44th UN General Assembly received the report of the Secretary General on youth issues, as directed by the 1988 Assembly resolution 43/94, and adopted a resolution entitled "Policies and programs involving youth" (Resolution 44/59) without a vote. The resolution called upon all member states to promote educational and employment opportunities for youth and directed the Secretary General to develop methods to facilitate communication and coordination among member states, the UN system and nongovernmental organizations on youth issues.

FAMILY

The United States strongly supports the protection and strengthening of the family as the basic social and economic unit of society. The 44th UN General Assembly adopted resolution 44/82, "International Year of the Family," without a vote. This resolution proclaimed 1994 as the International Year of the Family and requested the Secretary General to prepare a draft program for the preparation for and observance of the year.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH

UN Environment Program

The UN Environment Program (UNEP) was established in January 1973, pursuant to the UN General Assembly resolution 2997, implementing recommendations from the UN Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in June of 1972. UNEP evolved from a U.S. initiative, and since its inception the United States has been an active participant. UNEP's extensive mandate is to catalyze and coordinate environmental activities throughout the UN system, and to support efforts by national governments globally to deal with natural resource and environmental problems of universal interest.

The first UN program to be based in a developing country, UNEP is headquartered in Nairobi, Kenya, with regional offices in Bangkok, Geneva, Manama, Mexico City, Washington, D.C., and a liaison office in New York. An Industrial and Environmental Office is maintained by UNEP in Paris as well as a related Office of the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals in Geneva.

Dr. Mustafa Tolba (Egypt) is currently serving his fourth 4-year term as Executive Director of UNEP. The Deputy Executive Director for UNEP is William Mansfield, an American. The Governing Council is UNEP's program and policy oversight body. It is comprised of 58 member countries elected by the UN General Assembly to 4-year terms, with half of the council members elected every 2 years. Membership is apportioned regionally as follows: 16 African seats, 13 Asian, 10 Latin American, 6 Eastern European, and 13 Western European and others, including the United States. The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. The Governing Council has met biennially since 1987, holding its 15th session in Nairobi on May 15–26.

UNEP's essential Secretariat expenses are financed by the UN regular budget and amounted to $11.64 million for 1988–1989. A separate Environment Fund, supported by voluntary contributions from member states, provides financing for environmental initiatives undertaken by UNEP. While there has been a recent upward trend in contributions to the fund, concern has been expressed over the decline in the number of states contributing. For the 1990–1991 biennium, UNEP's Governing Council approved fund program activities amounted to $68 million with a reserve fund totaling $4 million.

The 15th Governing Council plenary approved plans to move the target date for receiving $100 million in annual contributions for the Environment Fund from 1995 to 1992. While agreeing in principle, both the United States and United Kingdom expressed reservations about the feasibility of accelerating this target date.

For 1989 the United States provided the largest share—$9.5 million, or 25 percent—of voluntary contributions paid to the fund.

GOVERNING COUNCIL

The 15th regular session of the UNEP Governing Council was attended by 54 member states, 49 observer states, 15 UN and Secretariat bodies, 19 UN specialized technical agencies, 8 intergovernmental organizations, 32 nongovernmental organizations and 2 UN observer groups. Credentials of all representatives were accepted without challenge.

The U.S. Delegation to the UNEP Governing Council was led by Dr. Frederick Bernthal, Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. In his opening address to the Council, Dr. Bernthal highlighted U.S. involvement in global and domestic environmental issues, emphasizing that "as a global community our first priority should be preventing pollution before it occurs."

The first week of the session focused on setting the international environmental agenda through the end of the century. Considerable debate focused on legal mechanisms and institutions to handle the task. In his introductory report, Dr. Tolba introduced six broad categories of global environmental concern that should receive UNEP's priority attention: atmospheric issues, fresh water, oceans and coastal areas, land degradation, impoverishment of biological diversity, and hazardous wastes and toxic chemicals.

Issues relating to climate change and the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development emerged as dominant themes, and extended negotiations focused on the issues of biological diversity and biotechnology. A draft decision to hold a special session of the UNEP Governing Council in 1990 was adopted by consensus and was transmitted to the UN Secretary General with a request for funds from the regular UN budget to pay for this extra session.

Decisions adopted by the Governing Council addressed issues such as multilateral environmental cooperation, foreign debt and development, UNEP regional and subregional programs, additional funding sources and improved language facilities for meetings of UNEP's Permanent Representatives. Several resolutions focused on specific problems of global environmental concern, such as desertification and oil spills.

UNEP System-Wide Medium-Term Environment Program (SWMTEP) for the period 1990–1995 received consensus approval. It will therefore continue on its present course without formal revision at this time, though the Governing Council recognized that some adaptation and adjustment of the original plans would be desirable. The preparations for the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development should provide sufficient opportunity for any needed reconsideration, however.

VIENNA CONVENTION AND THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

UNEP has sponsored the negotiations and served as interim Secretariat for two important international agreements that target reduction of chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's) and halon emissions which are degrading the stratospheric ozone layer. The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer entered into force in September 1988, following ratification by 20 governments. The Montreal Protocol for Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer entered into force in January 1989. The United States has signed and ratified both agreements. The dynamic hallmark of these agreements is the mandate for regularly convened meetings to review monitoring and control measures, and to implement appropriate changes. For example, in May 1989, a strong declaration at Helsinki committed governments to phasing out the CFC's that deplete the ozone layer by the year 2000, as well as to phasing out halons and other ozone-depleting substances within a feasible timeframe.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

In response to resolutions passed by the 14th regular session of the UNEP Governing Council and the 40th session of the Executive Council of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established in June 1988. Administered jointly by UNEP and WMO, the Panel set up three working groups to review the scientific data, impacts and response strategies with regard to the threat of global climate change. These groups are chaired by the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. and United States, respectively.

These working groups will compile their findings into a first assessment report by early fall, 1990. Negotiations on a framework convention that addresses the issue of global climate change are expected to commence shortly thereafter, drawing upon elements of legal and technical response options identified in the IPCC report. The first assessment report will be discussed at the Second World Climate Conference (SWCC) to be held in Geneva, October 29 to November 7.

TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENT OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

Several incidents in recent years have focused attention on the need for control of the international transport of hazardous waste. UNEP accordingly began work on a global agreement on the subject in 1987. Member governments met in February 1988, to discuss an international convention on hazardous waste shipments, and again in November to prepare a draft of the agreement. A Diplomatic Conference with representatives from over 100 countries was convened in March 1989, in Basel, Switzerland, to adopt the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal.

As of December, 40 countries and the Commission of the European Communities were signatories to the agreement, with the United States reserving its position pending a review of the final text. This convention establishes a prenotification and prior consent regime for exports and imports of hazardous and other wastes, and prohibits movement of these wastes to and from a nonparty unless there is an agreement providing for the environmentally sound management of these wastes within the receiving country.

BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

The 15th session of the UNEP Governing Council unanimously authorized the executive director, in consultation with governments, to convene an *ad hoc* working group of legal and technical experts with a mandate to negotiate an international legal instrument for the conservation of biological diversity.

The United States has taken a lead role in the negotiating process, emphasizing the need for a consensus document that can both address the urgent need for action in the field of species and habitat protection. and effectively mobilize substantial new resources apart from existing multilateral and bilateral arrangements.

REGIONAL SEAS

The United States actively participates in the two UNEP regional seas programs which include U.S. territories in the Caribbean and South Pacific. In June 1988 a steering committee was established to give participating governments a greater role in management of the South Pacific Regional Environmental Program (SPREP). This steering committee expressed satisfaction with and endorsed continuation of the South Pacific Action Plan that was developed with UNEP's guidance. The United States and other delegates encouraged resumption of UNEP's full financial and substantive support for SPREP, and it was announced that UNEP would participate fully in future SPREP activities as part of the regional seas program.

The Caribbean Environment Program (CEP) promotes the environmentally sound development of that region within the framework of UNEP's regional seas program. CEP looks primarily to the United States for support, since it is the only fully developed country in the area.

The Cartegena Convention sets up general obligations in a legal framework within which specific protocols aimed at protecting the Caribbean marine environment are negotiated and adopted. The most recent protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) was expected to be signed in January 1990, with the ratification process to begin after the negotiation and adoption of several annexes to the protocol.

UNEP IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

UNEP continues to be the principal organ in the UN system for addressing issues of the environment. However, with the growing worldwide interest in this subject, the General Assembly has substantially increased its own activity in the field. Besides accepting the UNEP annual report, the 44th General Assembly adopted 10 resolutions on the environment, and carved out a major role for itself in the extensive preparations envisioned for the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development.

UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

The UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR)* was established by the General Assembly in 1955 to provide continuous review and evaluation of the effects of ionizing radiation on humans and their environment. Radiation in this context covers both natural and man-made (i.e., from atmospheric and surface nuclear explosions), environmental radiation and medical and occupational exposures.

---

* The member states are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peoples Republic of China, Peru, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States.

Under its terms of reference, the Committee receives, assembles and compiles reports and information furnished by its member states, members of the United Nations, specialized agencies, the IAEA and nongovernmental organizations on observed levels of ionizing radiation and on scientific observations and experiments relevant to the effects of ionizing radiation on man and the environment.

Since its establishment, the Committee has prepared and submitted to the UN General Assembly seven comprehensive reports on the effects of ionizing radiation. In addition to collection and evaluation of the literature on radiation effects, UNSCEAR agreed in 1973 to evaluate the radiological hazards created by the testing activities of one country if asked to do so by a neighboring country which was potentially at risk. To date, no such evaluations have been requested.

The 38th session of UNSCEAR met in Vienna from May 8 to 12. The U.S. Representative was Fred A. Mettler, Jr., M.D., Professor and Chairman of Radiology at the University of New Mexico. The session was concerned with consideration of chapters for a future report to the General Assembly on the effects of ionizing radiation.

The Committee examined a number of problems that might require detailed review and, on the basis of documents prepared by the UNSCEAR Secretariat and further discussion, the Committee decided to undertake studies in the following fields:

(1) Doses from natural sources of radiation, especially radon.

(2) Doses from man-made sources of radiation in the environment.

(3) Medical radiation exposures.

(4) Occupational radiation exposures and trends.

(5) Effects of radiation exposures on plants and animals in the environment.

(6) Epidemiological studies of radiation effects in human populations.

(7) Effects of radiation on the developing human brain from prenatal exposure.

(8) Dose and dose rate effects on radiation response.

(9) Mechanisms of radiation carcinogenesis.

(10) Possible stimulatory effects of low doses of radiation.

(11) Hereditary effects of radiation in human populations.

(12) Perception of radiation risks.

The concepts and methodologies for comparative assessment of effects and risks in interactions of toxic chemicals and radiation is one subject that the Committee will keep under consideration drawing upon the experience developed in various international organizations and scientific bodies.

The Committee expressed hopes that member states would continue to assist in its work through the provision of relevant information. The Committee also noted with satisfaction that its 1988 report to the General Assembly with scientific annexes has been issued as a UN sales publication.

The Committee decided to hold its 39th session at the Vienna International Center for May 14–18, 1990.

New and Renewable Sources of Energy

The UN Committee on Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE) was established by UN General Assembly resolution 37/250. The Committee is open to the participation of all full members of the UN General Assembly. The functions of the Committee are to recommend guidelines for UN organs and subsidiary bodies on new and renewable sources of energy, on the basis of the 1981 Nairobi Program of Action, and to carry out the Nairobi Program by mobilizing resources for its implementation. The Committee meets every even year and thus did not meet in 1989. Its next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 26–April 3, 1990.

In order to limit the expansion of the UN bureaucracy in this field, the United States opposed the establishment of permanent institutional arrangements for implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action from the outset. Four meetings of the NRSE committee have made little progress in mobilizing development efforts for new and renewable sources of energy. A number of UN member states, including the United States, have called for the elimination of this Committee or its merger with the Committee on Natural Resources.

Science and Technology for Development

In 1979 the General Assembly created three bodies to deal with science and technology for development: (1) the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development (IGCSTD) to formulate policy guidelines and identify priorities and activities in this area, which would be open for participation by all UN members; (2) the Center for Science and Technology for Development to coordinate science and technology activities within the United Nations at the Secretariat level and to serve the Intergovernmental Committee; and (3) the voluntarily funded Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, which the UN Development Program (UNDP) would administer until the end of 1981. The General Assembly gave the Interim Fund permanent status in 1982 as the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

In 1982 the General Assembly adopted a resolution designed to keep open the institutional debate on science and technology for development. Although the resolution established long-term financial and institutional arrangements, it left open the difficult questions of the proposed financing plan and the voting arrangements for its Executive Board. These were further negotiated at two sessions of the IGCSTD in 1983. Since attendees could not reach agreement, the Secretary General was asked to undertake consultations with governments on the money issues again and, if he were satisfied that there was sufficient interest, to call a pledging conference. There was insufficient interest among governments, and the Secretary General did not convene the conference.

Each year thereafter, the same issues arose. Member nations expressed insufficient interest, and voluntary contributions sufficient to support proposed activities have failed to materialize.

In 1985 the Secretary General and the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development again prepared operating proposals. The proposed system would be closely linked to the operations of the UNDP and would provide for a modest staff. While the United States did not oppose science and technology activity carried out through a separate UN organization, we continued to oppose the establishment of "multilaterally pooled funds" for this purpose. The United States recommended that the United Nations limit its activities to playing a broker's role, bringing together potential projects in developing countries with sources of financing and technology in the developed world, including the private sector.

In the face of declining interest on the part of member governments in reaching agreement on either the structure or the funding of the Financing System, the UN Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation prepared recommendations for the Intergovernmental Committee providing for termination of the Financing System and the transfer of its activities and residual resources to a trust fund under UNDP management. (In effect, this proposal would recognize the practical arrangements which had been in place since 1980.)

The Intergovernmental Committee, at its June 2–6, 1986, session, approved the proposals of the Director General. Upon receiving the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee, the UNDP Governing Council in late June, by a unanimous decision: (1) established a trust fund for science and technology for development with effect from January 1, 1987; (2) stipulated that the administrative costs of this new facility would be borne by the fund itself; (3) invited governments which would have contributed to the Financing System to transfer such pledges to the trust fund; (4) urged all governments and the international community as a whole to provide resources to the new fund; and (5) requested the Administrator of UNDP to report to the Council in 1987 on the organizational structure, staffing and budget of the new facility.

Acting upon the decision of the Governing Council, the UN General Assembly, in resolution 41/183, decided to terminate the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and to transfer its responsibilities and resources to a facility within UNDP entitled, "The UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development" (UNFSTD).

In 1988 the UNDP Governing Council reported that the new arrangements for enhancing the work of UNDP in the fields of science, technology and energy had resulted in administrative cost savings; but that pledges for core resources of the new UNFSTD were low. The Council decided to approve the Administrator's proposal to close the Energy Office, while maintaining it as a separate subaccount of the Fund in order to receive contributions for energy sector activities. The Council affirmed the importance of the Fund as a focal point in the UNDP for assistance in strengthening the national, subregional and regional capacities of developing countries in the management of technological change and invited all governments to increase their pledges to the core resources of the Fund.

The 10th session of the UN Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development (IGC), which met at UN Headquarters in New York City in August 1989, undertook an end of decade review of the implementation of the Vienna Program of Action and of the activities of the UN Center for Science and Technology for Development.

At that session, the United States continued to urge the IGC to take a critical look at its organization of work and to focus its attention on a selected number of issues where it could achieve practical results; particularly important being the critical role of science and technology in economic growth. We noted the advances made in more clearly defining the functions of the UN Center for Science and Technology. We also noted the improved focus of the IGC's work on specific substantive themes, and concentration on its role in policy development and coordination.

The IGC adopted by consensus two resolutions endorsing the work of the Center and reaffirming the Vienna Program of Action. The United States joined consensus while noting the U.S. belief that IGC work could be handled by ECOSOC.

A particularly positive outcome of the ICG meeting was the willingness expressed by a U.S. nongovernmental organization, American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), at the request of IGC to cosponsor a North American workshop to focus on the role of developing countries in research, development and the application of science and technology. AIAA has checked with the UN Committee on Outer Space Affairs to ensure the proposed workshop does not duplicate work now being done. The latter has reacted positively to the idea, may endorse and possibly cosponsor the workshop.

The 44th UN General Assembly took note of the report of the IGC's 10th session.

UN University

The UN University (UNU), founded in 1973, is a nondegree-conferring postgraduate institution that coordinates studies on a range of issues of significance to the United Nations such as nutrition, energy and development. A number of American scholars collaborated on UNU projects during 1989. The UNU is supported by voluntary contributions. Its headquarters is in Tokyo, and Japan is its principal benefactor. The United States, as a Government, did not play a role in UNU activities during 1989.

University for Peace

At the 35th session of the UN General Assembly in 1980, the United States joined the consensus approving the establishment of the University for Peace. The United States did not sign the International Agreement which was annexed to the resolution because we believed that support of existing institutions already working in the field of peace research would be a more efficient use of resources. Moreover, the United States considered it important that any new institutional arrangements for the University not divert resources from existing institutions nor impose any new funding requirements upon UN member states.

The United States continues to have reservations about the capacity of the University for Peace to acquire the funding base and academic infrastructure necessary to make a sustained academic contribution to high-level analysis of peace issues. As a Government, the United States played no role in the University for Peace during 1989.

UN Institute for Training and Research

BACKGROUND AND STRUCTURE

The UN General Assembly established the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in 1965 as a result of a U.S. initiative embodied in Assembly resolutions in 1962 and 1963. UNITAR is an autonomous UN institution established with the intent of enhancing the effectiveness of the structure and function of the UN system through training delegates to the United Nations in the operation of the UN system, its governing bodies and the issues it addresses, as well as through research on the UN system and issues.

Headquartered in New York, UNITAR is managed by an Executive Director, who is appointed by the UN Secretary General after consultation with the Board of Trustees. Incumbent Executive Director Michel Doo Kingue has directed UNITAR since January 1983. UNITAR also has a liaison office in Geneva.

A Board of Trustees provides policy guidance and direction. The Board is composed of no less than 11, nor more than 30, members appointed by the Secretary General, in consultation with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, including four *ex officio* members: the UN Secretary General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of the ECOSOC and the UNITAR Executive Director. In 1989 the Board of Trustees consisted of 17 appointed members, who serve in their personal capacities and not as formal representatives of governments. In January 1989 former Ambassador Lawrence Eagleburger, who had represented the United States on the Board since his appointment in September 1988 resigned to accept an appointment as Deputy Secretary of State. The United States has not named a successor to Mr. Eagleburger.

At the time of UNITAR's establishment, the UN General Assembly directed that it be wholly dependent upon voluntary contributions. However, since the early 1980s when UNITAR began experiencing financial difficulties, the United Nations, has subsidized UNITAR's operations in a variety of ways. In 1980 and 1981, the General Assembly provided financial assistance in the form of "grants-in-aid." In 1983, over the strong objections of the United States, the 38th General Assembly awarded UNITAR an "advance" of up to $886,000 on a "non-recurrent, reimbursable basis," to be repaid in installments of about $100,000 annually beginning in 1986. In 1984, after the 39th UN General Assembly adopted resolution 39/177 granting UNITAR an additional $1.5 million, albeit on an exceptional basis, to supplement funds raised through voluntary contributions to the General Fund, the United States reduced its pledge to UNITAR for 1985 by an amount equivalent to the U.S. proportionate share of the grant, or $375,000.

In 1986, as a result of the inability of UNITAR and the General Assembly to resolve UNITAR's long-term financial problems within UNITAR's mandate, the United States ceased making a pledge to UNITAR. It was also that year that the United States publicly announced a position that continues to prevail: UNITAR functions do not justify its continuation as a separate institution. If it is unable to operate within available non-UN General Assembly resources, UNITAR should be abolished and its training function be placed elsewhere within the UN system.

In 1987, however, the 41st General Assembly decided to give UNITAR another chance. Adopted by consensus, resolution 41/172 called for restructuring the Institute over a 3-year period (1987–1989) and for concentrating UNITAR's activities on training. (It also requested the Secretary General to take steps in 1987 to close UNITAR should sufficient funding not be forthcoming.) A decision was taken to sell UNITAR's headquarters property in order to repay its debt to the United Nations.

UNITAR IN 1989

The UNITAR Board of Trustees held its 27th regular session from March 30 to April 7 in New York. The Secretary General informed the Board that purchase of the land under the UNITAR building would soon be finalized. Such action would open the way for sale of the entire UNITAR property. The Board agreed that the United Nations should be repaid its $2.5 million advance to UNITAR in one installment out of the proceeds from the sale of the UNITAR property. It discussed the relocation of UNITAR headquarters. The Executive Director reported on UNITAR activities. After reviewing the Institute's financial situation in 1988, in which income exceeded expenditures, the Board approved UNITAR's 1989 budget of $1.2 million, but called for reductions in expenditures if income in 1989 proved inadequate. The Board welcomed a recommendation that governments in a position to do so establish trust funds from which UNITAR could draw on the interest for its general fund.

The Board decided the UNITAR Office in Geneva, whose work is often supported by special purpose grants, should remain open and continue its activities. It approved the publication of a UNITAR newsletter and the appointment of three Senior Fellows. The Board recommended to the Secretary General that he seek UN General Assembly approval for UNITAR to be an executing agency of the UN Development Program (UNDP) and provided guidance to UNITAR Executive Director on the 1990–1991 work program for the Institute.

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In December the 44th UN General Assembly adopted resolution 44/175 which reaffirmed the validity and relevance of UNITAR's mandate, as amended, commended measures the Secretary General had taken to implement resolutions 43/201 and encouraged him to take further steps. It authorized UNITAR to enter into appropriate arrangements with UNDP to become an executing agent. In adopting the resolution, the General Assembly urged the Secretary General to proceed rapidly with the sale of UNITAR headquarters and reaffirmed its approval for establishment of a reserve fund with the proceeds remaining after the sale of the UNITAR properties and repayment of its UN debts. It urged UNITAR to submit its 1990 and future budget proposals to the UN's Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) for review and comment prior to approval by the Institute's Board of

Trustees and urged member states to support UNITAR financially. The Secretary General was requested to report to the 45th General Assembly on the longer-term issues related to financing of the Institute, to continue to explore new modalities for greater interface among UN research bodies, and to report to the 45th General Assembly on implementation of resolution 44/175.

In resolution 44/183, the General Assembly *inter alia* requested the UNITAR Board of Trustees, among other UN agency governing bodies, to require its executive head to take steps to correct or improve conditions that resulted in issuance of qualified audit opinions by the Board of Auditors and urged UNITAR to solve technical problems that auditors might have identified. The General Assembly also endorsed observations and recommendations by the UN Board of Auditors and the ACABQ. The Secretary General as well as the UNITAR Executive Director, and other UN agencies mentioned in the resolution, are to report to the 45th General Assembly on actions taken.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The principal human rights organ of the United Nations, the Human Rights Commission (UNHRC), held its 45th annual session January 30 through March 10. The U.S. Delegation was headed for the second consecutive year by Armando Valladares, the U.S. Representative to the Commission. ECOSOC subsequently considered the Commission's report at its first regular session in New York May 2 through 26. Finally, the General Assembly's 44th session, held from September 19 to December 29, considered a lengthy agenda of human rights issues. The 41st session of the Commission's Expert Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was held from August 7 to September 1.

Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba

A matter of prime interest to the United States was presentation of the Cuban Working Group (CWG) report to the 45th UN Human Rights Commission. An intense 2-year international effort spearheaded by the United States had come to fruition when the 44th (1988) session of the UN Human Rights Commission decided to send a team to Cuba to investigate the numerous allegations of systemic violations of human rights in Cuba. This was the first time action had ever been taken at the United Nations concerning the human rights situation in Cuba.

The UN team had been headed by the Commission Chairman, Ambassador Alioune Sene of Senegal, and the team members represented each of the five regional areas. The investigation took place in September 1988. The Chairman's decision requested that the team present the report of its investigation at the 45th (1989) UN Human Rights Commission.

During the CWG's visit, the Cuban Government attempted to fill the schedule with irrelevant activities and late night briefings. Prisons and other showcase sites had been spruced up in preparation for the team and some political prisoners had been released. The focusing of international attention on Cuba led to a number of temporary improvements in the area of human rights, such as releasing some political prisoners and allowing them to emigrate, showing limited tolerance for Cuban human rights groups, and permitting internationally recognized human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and the International Committee of the Red Cross, to visit Cuba. Nevertheless, systemic abuses of human rights continued to take place following the CWG visit as evidenced by reports of repressive actions subsequently taken by Cuban authorities against human rights activists including some of those who had given evidence to the CWG. This was in violation of Cuban Government promises to the contrary.

The results of the CWG visit were a 400-page report and nearly 2 days of debate in the 1989 UNHRC session. This was the largest report on a single country ever issued by the UNHRC. The diverse make-up of the CWG and its members agreement to work by consensus precluded a unanimous critical conclusion, but it was noteworthy that so much negative evidence was included and that representatives of six very different countries agreed on so much. The report left no doubt over the dismal state of human rights in Cuba.

As a result of the human rights picture presented by the CWG and the above debate, the United States introduced a resolution calling for the CWG to continue its scrutiny of Cuba and report to the 46th UNHRC. A competing resolution was introduced by Panama which in its original form would have removed criticism relating to Cuba. When it became clear that the U.S.-sponsored resolution would not attract sufficient votes to be adopted, the United States withdrew its own resolution and sought to achieve consensus support for amendments to the Panamanian decision that would call on the Secretary General to maintain contacts with the Government and people of Cuba and to report to the Commission as appropriate. The Cuban Delegation objected vigorously to inclusion of the language calling on the Secretary General to maintain contacts with "the Government and the people" of Cuba. Nevertheless, the Cubans were forced by this to modify somewhat the Panamanian decision to attract support of Commission members.

When the U.S. amendments were brought up for a vote, two countries which had earlier indicated their support for the amendments reversed their positions, and the amendments lost on a tied vote of 17 (U.S.) to 17, with 8 abstentions. The weaker Panamanian decision was then adopted in its slightly modified form, with both U.S. and Cuban support, 32 (U.S.) to 1, with 10 abstentions. (Decision 1989/113.) The approved decision called for the Secretary General to maintain his direct contacts and take up their results "in an appropriate manner." The U.S. Delegation continued to maintain that this meant for the Secretary General to followup on the issues raised in the 11 (bis) debate and the CWG report and to present his own report to the next session of the Commission.

Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance

The right to freedom of religion has been a longstanding U.S. concern within the Human Rights Commission. At the 45th session of the UNHRC (1989), the United States cosponsored and vigorously supported a draft resolution introduced by Canada entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief" (Resolution 1989/44), which was adopted by consensus. The resolution called upon states to take appropriate measures to combat religious intolerance. In a statement before the Commission, the U.S. Delegation deplored the religious persecution still firmly rooted in the political systems of many countries; at the same time, the statement noted some cause for hope in the Soviet Union and other countries where signs of increased tolerance for the practice of religion had appeared.

The 44th UN General Assembly continued its annual discussion of the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance as a major human rights issue. Ireland, which has taken the lead on this subject in recent years, again introduced a draft resolution which reaffirmed the principles of the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief and called for an end to religious intolerance. This resolution was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 44/131.)

Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East

Following a pattern that has continued unbroken since 1968, the Human Rights Commission once again debated the agenda item entitled "Question of the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, Including Palestine" at the outset of the 45th session. The United States vigorously opposed this annual and fruitless debate for its exaggerated and inaccurate rhetoric condemning Israel. Resolution 1989/1, introduced by the Representative of Cuba and cosponsored by several Arab and Communist countries, dealt with the human rights situation in occupied Syrian territories. This resolution, very similar to that submitted in 1985 by Nicaragua, contained numerous objectionable paragraphs, including unsubstantiated allegations against Israel. This resolution was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions.

The Indian Delegation put forward a two-part companion resolution cosponsored mainly by Arab and Communist countries, which contained the annual string of inflammatory and unsupported condemnations of alleged

Israeli policies and practices. Part A of resolution 1989/2 passed by a vote of 32 to 8 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. Part B focused upon the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and contained further allegations of Israeli violations. The draft resolution contained one provision which reaffirmed that the Geneva Convention is applicable to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. In a separate vote on this paragraph, the United States voted in favor. In another separate vote on the operative paragraph that called for prisoner-of-war status for all Palestinian fighters captured by Israel, the paragraph was adopted by 31 votes to 8 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. Part B of this resolution was adopted by a vote of 32 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions.

At the 44th UN General Assembly, several resolutions concerning Israel were introduced as matters considered directly by the General Assembly without reference to a main committee. The majority of these seemed little more than exercises in anti-Israel propaganda and repeated standard themes from earlier years. For a summary of the developments regarding the situation in the Middle East, the question of Palestine, and Israeli practices in the occupied territories, see pages 12 through 19.

Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa

The subject of racial discrimination, with the focus on apartheid in South Africa, was again prominent on the agendas of both the Human Rights Commission and the General Assembly and was the subject of a special session of the General Assembly during December 1989. At the 45th Commission session, racial discrimination and apartheid were considered under a cluster of four agenda items which regularly appear on the Commission's agendas year after year. In the debate, the U.S. Delegation expressed the revulsion the U.S. Government feels toward apartheid. The U.S. statement presented a defense of U.S. policies *vis-a-vis* South Africa, outlined what America was willing to do to end this degrading system and asked that the U.S. policy of moderation and gradual change be given the time to succeed.

The United States has for several years sought at least one draft resolution on South Africa and apartheid that expressed the universal condemnation of the apartheid system felt by all delegations but which did so in balanced and noninflammatory terms. In the 44th UNHRC, the U.S. Delegation had been able to join consensus on a resolution about the detention of children in South Africa (Resolution 1988/11) and in the 45th session was again able to join consensus on the corresponding resolution. (Resolution 1989/4.)

Resolution 1989/3 concerning the situation of human rights in Namibia, which was based upon the report of the Commission's *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa, contained general condemnations of apartheid and a number of other provisions which the U.S. Government could not accept. The United States therefore abstained on the resolution based on the U.S. role in assisting all concerned parties to arrive at a peaceful, negotiated solution which will facilitate the earliest possible independence for Namibia. The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 32 to 0, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). Another draft resolution was also based on the same report by the Commission's *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa; this resolution dealt with the situation of human rights in South Africa and contained the same type of unhelpful and unbalanced condemnation of South Africa, along with a call for adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The vote on this resolution (1989/5) was 35 to 3 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions.

The United States voted against a resolution entitled, "The adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist regimes in southern Africa" that was virtually identical with draft resolutions from earlier years. The vote was 31 to 8 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The United States and others rejected provisions of that resolution that condemned various forms of economic activity carried out by Western corporations in South Africa. (Resolution 1989/7.) At the same meeting, the Commission considered a draft resolution under the same title that recommended that the Economic and Social Council endorse the report on this subject submitted by the Special Rapporteur of the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 32 to 7 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/6.)

Resolution 1989/8 concerned the implementation of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and was approved by a vote of 32 to 1, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained because the resolution contained provisions equating apartheid with genocide and condemning transnational corporations engaged in legal activities.

Finally, a resolution relating to the implementation of the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. The resolution covered the Program of Action for the Second Decade. (Resolution 1989/9.) The United States did not participate in this vote, following its long-held policy of nonparticipation in voting on resolutions relating to the Second Decade. The policy of nonparticipation dates from UN General Assembly adoption in 1975 of a resolution equating Zionism with racism.

At the first regular session of ECOSOC for 1989, the situation of human rights in South Africa was again on the agenda. A resolution was passed on the implementation of the Program of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. (Resolution 1989/83.) For the reasons above, the United States did not participate in the vote. ECOSOC also adopted resolutions on the adverse consequences of assistance to South Africa (Resolution 1989/73) and the infringements of trade union rights in South Africa. (Resolution 1989/82). The former was adopted by a vote of 37 to 7 (U.S.) with 8 abstentions, while the latter resolution was adopted by consensus.

At the 44th UN General Assembly, a number of resolutions were adopted on items relating to racial discrimination and apartheid which were considered by the Third Committee. The United States again did not participate in the vote on a resolution relating to the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 44/52.) The resolution contained a number of operative paragraphs encouraging governments to continue supporting the Decade Program and endorsing certain measures under that Program. The United States joined consensus on a resolution concerning the torture and inhuman treatment of children in detention in South Africa and Namibia. (Resolution 44/143.) The United States also joined consensus on a resolution concerning assistance to student refugees in South Africa. (Resolution 44/157.)

Resolution 44/69 concerning the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The U.S. opposition was due mainly to provisions in the resolution equating apartheid with genocide and elaborating the idea that transnational corporations operating in South Africa are committing the crime of apartheid. A resolution on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 44/68.)

Self-Determination

The right to self-determination retained its place on the agendas of human rights organs in 1989 as one of the most widely discussed of the basic human rights. At its 45th session, the Human Rights Commission adopted six resolutions under this recurring agenda item.

A resolution concerning the question of the Western Sahara, sponsored by Cuba with mainly African cosponsors, reiterated earlier calls for all parties to the conflict to hold direct negotiations for the political solution of the question. The resolution was approved by a vote of 24 to 0, with 17 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1989/18.)

A draft resolution, sponsored in this session by Bangladesh, was again introduced in the Commission dealing with the right of self-determination for Palestine. The cosponsors of the draft resolution were primarily Arab and Communist states. A number of the resolution's preambular and operative paragraphs were directed specifically against Israel. The resolution was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/19.)

The question of self-determination for Kampuchea (Cambodia) was again addressed in a resolution proposed by the Philippines and cosponsored by other Asian, Western and Latin American Delegations. In its principal operative paragraphs, this resolution reaffirmed that the continuing illegal occupation of Kampuchea by foreign forces deprives the people of Kampuchea of the right to self-determination and constitutes the primary violation of human rights in Kampuchea at present. The resolution was approved by a vote of 35 (U.S.) to 7, with 1 abstention. (Resolution 1989/20.)

The situation of self-determination in southern Africa was also addressed in a draft resolution sponsored by Ethiopia. The draft resolution contained general denunciations of apartheid in South Africa and operative paragraph 10 condemned South Africa's "wanton acts of aggression and destabilization." The Federal Republic of Germany requested a separate vote on this paragraph, but the language was retained by a vote of 31 to 8 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 33 votes to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/22.)

The Chairman of the Commission put forward a resolution on the denial of human rights in Afghanistan. The resolution, which welcomed the completion of withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and called for the establishment of a broad-based representative government that would enable the Afghan people freely to exercise their right to self-determination, was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1989/23.)

The first regular session of ECOSOC passed a supporting decision on self-determination in Kampuchea which was complementary to UN Human Rights Commission resolution 1989/20. (Decision 1989/156.) The decision reaffirmed the principal operative paragraphs of Commission resolution 1989/20, noted the announcement by Viet Nam that it would withdraw all its occupying forces by September 1989 but expressed grave concern at the severity and scope of attacks on Kampuchean civilians located in Thai refugee camps, and requested the Secretary General to report to ECOSOC any further violations of humanitarian principles perpetrated against Kampuchean civilian refugees by foreign occupying troops along the border.

At the 44th UN General Assembly, two more resolutions concerning the right to self-determination were approved. A general resolution entitled Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination declared the Assembly's firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, since these have resulted in the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination and other human rights in certain parts of the world. The resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 44/80.) A much more controversial draft resolution proposed by the African Group contained 44 operative paragraphs featuring numerous provisions directed at the policies of Western states and Israel, both in South Africa and Palestine, and contained a strong call for sanctions against South Africa. The resolution was approved by a vote of 123 to 15 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 44/79.)

The issue of mercenaries is also considered by the United Nations under the agenda item of self-determination. The Commission approved a resolution entitled "The use of mercenaries as a means to impede the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination" by a vote of 32 to 10 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 1989/21.) The United States opposed this resolution, which urged states to prohibit the recruitment, financing, training and transit of mercenaries, as outside the Commission's mandate and duplicative of work being done by the UN General Assembly's Sixth Committee. The UN General Assembly approved by a vote of 125 to 10 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions a resolution on "The use of mercenaries as a means to violate human rights and to impede the exercise of the right of people to self-determination." (Resolution 44/81.) The United States opposed the resolution's unbalanced criticism of South Africa for alleged use of armed mercenaries against national liberation movements and to destabilize other southern African states.

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

In 1989 the less developed nations maintained their interest in claiming economic, social and cultural "rights," in particular focusing on the so-called "right to development." In general, the United States maintains the view that economic, social and cultural advances are goals of government economic and social policies to be achieved progressively rather than rights to be granted immediately.

Under the agenda item entitled "Question of the realization in all countries of the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and study of special problems which the developing countries face in their efforts to achieve these human rights," the 45th session of the Commission received another progress report from its Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development as well as a report from the Secretary General on respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others. The latter report was in response to a U.S. resolution adopted by consensus during the 1988 Commission session. The 1989 Commission also adopted seven resolutions under this agenda item.

France sponsored two resolutions, one on human rights and extreme poverty (Resolution 1989/10) and the other on nondiscrimination in the field of health (Resolution 1989/11). Both resolutions were adopted without a vote.

Also adopted under the agenda item relating to economic, social and cultural rights was a draft resolution proposed by the German Democratic Republic and other mainly Eastern European cosponsors which was designed to heighten the place given to the economic, social and cultural group of rights in the Commission's debates. The draft resolution contained a provision recognizing that the realization of the right to development will promote the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights and operative provisions highlighting the importance of economic rights such as the rights to food, work, education and health. The resolution also attempted to link disarmament with the right to development by asserting that moneys saved by disarmament could be channeled to developing countries. This resolution was approved by a vote of 31 to 10 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 1989/12). The United States does not accept the linkage between disarmament and the right to development and believes that disarmament is a topic to be discussed in disarmament fora rather than a human rights forum such as the Commission. The Portuguese Delegation introduced a related resolution on the operations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, a body formed under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, to which the United States is not a party. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/13.)

The Delegation of Yugoslavia once again demonstrated its special interest in the subject of "popular participation in its various forms as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights" by proposing a procedural resolution which took note of and requested comments on a study prepared by the Secretary General on the right to popular participation. The resolution requests the Secretary General to submit a report containing the comments to the 46th (1990) session of the Commission. This resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1989/14.)

A further Yugoslavian draft resolution on the right to development was also introduced. In an explanation before the vote, the U.S. Delegation stated that although the resolution would be adopted without a vote, the United States would not participate in the vote. (Resolution 1989/45.)

The Representative of Peru introduced a draft resolution, cosponsored primarily by other Latin American nations, on foreign debt and economic adjustment policies and their effects on the full enjoyment of human rights, in particular the right to development. The draft resolution also called for specific consideration of this topic at the 46th (1990) session of the Commission. The United Kingdom moved that the Commission declare itself not competent to adopt this draft resolution, but the motion was defeated by a vote of 11 for (U.S.) to 26 against, with 3 abstentions. In a roll-call vote on the resolution as a whole, it was adopted by 30 votes to 6 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/15.)

At its first regular session of 1989, ECOSOC approved decision 1989/138 on the realization of economic, social and cultural rights. The decision endorsed requests made by the Human Rights Commission (Resolutions 1989/12 and 1989/13) that the Secretary General provide a special rapporteur with all the assistance he might require to complete a study on the problems, policies and progressive measures relating to the effective realization of economic, social and cultural rights. A further ECOSOC decision on the right to development was also adopted (Decision 1989/141) which approved Human Rights Commission resolution 1989/45 inviting the Secretary General to organize, within existing resources, a global consultation on the realization of the right to development.

ECOSOC also adopted resolution 1989/47 on social welfare, development and science and technology, which in particular stresses the necessity of using scientific and technological progress as a major aspect of fully implementing fundamental political, economic, social and cultural rights, and resolution 1989/71 on the achievement of social justice.

The UN General Assembly generally considers development issues under the agenda item entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the UN system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms." Resolution 44/63, bearing this title, was adopted by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions; the resolution maintained that the right to development is an inalienable human right. Resolution 44/62 on the right to development called on the Secretary General to organize a global consultation on the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development and was adopted without a vote. The United States did not participate in adoption of the latter resolution. A resolution on the indivisibility and interdependence of economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights (Resolution 44/130) was adopted by 124 votes to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.).

Resolution 44/55, "Achievement of Social Justice," expressed the sense of the General Assembly that "the common purpose of the international community must be to forge from varied economic, social and political conditions a global environment of sustained development, full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and social justice and peace." The resolution was adopted without a vote.

Free Elections

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, the United States had put forward a high visibility initiative on enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections. (Resolution 43/157.) This initiative had been undertaken as a major step toward the U.S. goal of introducing resolutions in UN fora representing democratic values. The resolution had also requested the Human Rights Commission to consider appropriate ways and means of enhancing the principle of periodic and genuine elections.

At its 45th (1989) session, the Commission considered the U.S. draft resolution on this subject and adopted it by consensus. (Resolution 1989/51.) The resolution was accompanied by an annex giving a framework for future efforts to ensure that the will of the people could be expressed through periodic and genuine elections that would serve as the basis for the authority of government, and the resolution recommended that this framework be adopted by the General Assembly. The Commission also voted to refer draft decision 1989/10 to ECOSOC for adoption, recommending to the General Assembly that it adopt the framework for future efforts. In its decision 1989/145, adopted at its first regular session of the year, ECOSOC took note of the Commission resolution and recommended that the General Assembly adopt the framework.

Obtaining adoption of a resolution on the principle of periodic and genuine elections was one of the United States' prime goals in the 44th General Assembly. After intensive negotiations by the United States and Western allies with a broad range of other UN members, the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/146 by consensus. The resolution stressed the conviction that periodic and genuine elections are a necessary and indispensable element of efforts to protect the rights and interests of the governed and that the right of everyone to take part in the government of his or her country was a crucial factor in the effective enjoyment by all of a wide range of other human rights and fundamental freedoms. The resolution also called on the Human Rights Commission to continue its consideration of appropriate ways and means of enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections and included the topic on the agenda for the 45th General Assembly.

A competing draft resolution, introduced by Cuba, stressed respect for the principles of national sovereignty and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states in their electoral processes. An operative paragraph of the resolution also "reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of all peoples under colonial and foreign domination, particularly the Palestinian people, for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence that will allow them to determine their political, economic and social system, without external interference." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 113 to 23 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. (Resolution 44/147.)

Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment

The Human Rights Commission annually examines as a continuing area of human rights concern the question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment. Connected with this agenda item are the sub-issues of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the question of enforced or involuntary disappearances, the question of human rights in the administration of justice and the right to freedom of expression and opinion.

The subject of torture was addressed in several resolutions approved under this agenda item. A resolution sponsored by Sweden and cosponsored by 32 others, including the United States and the U.S.S.R., dealt with the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/29.) The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution, again put forward by Sweden and cosponsored by the United States among others, encouraging support for the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture. (Resolution 1989/30.) A third resolution on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, sponsored by Belgium, was also adopted without a vote. The resolution commended the special rapporteur on the subject for his report to the Commission and called upon all states to sign and accede to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment as soon as possible. (Resolution 1989/33.)

In the course of deliberation on this agenda item, a member of the U.S. Delegation made a moving statement condemning torture wherever it occurred, drawing on his own experiences as a prisoner of war.

Concerning the subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances, France once again took the lead in proposing a resolution which commended the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances for its work and urged as many governments as possible to cooperate with the working group. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/27.) France also introduced a resolution on hostage-taking which condemned those who take hostages, whatever their motives. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/26.) A resolution on political prisoners was introduced by the United Kingdom and was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/56.)

The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on human rights in the administration of justice. (Resolution 1989/24.) The resolution called for member states to spare no efforts in providing legislation and other mechanisms to ensure effective implementation of international standards relating to human rights in the administration of justice, in particular to the unacknowledged detention of persons. The resolution also noted the role that nongovernmental organizations, including professional associations of lawyers and judges, could play in the promotion of human rights in the administration of justice. The Commission adopted without a vote a companion resolution introduced by Belgium on the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers. (Resolution 1989/32.)

The Commission adopted without a vote a resolution on the right to freedom of expression and opinion. (Resolution 1989/31.) Another resolution adopted without a vote was a procedural measure introduced by the Federal Republic of Germany which called on the Commission to submit to the 44th session of the UN General Assembly the draft text of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aimed at the abolition of the death penalty. (Resolution 1989/25.) Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution, introduced by Portugal and cosponsored by the United States among others, requesting the Secretary General to continue his efforts to secure the release of UN personnel held in detention and to ensure that the privileges and immunities of international civil servants are fully respected. (Resolution 1989/28.)

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, the Council adopted a resolution on principles and guarantees for the protection of persons detained on grounds of mental ill-health and authorized an open-ended working group of the Human Rights Commission to meet before the Commission's 46th session to continue work on the draft principles and guarantees. (Resolution 1989/76.)

At the General Assembly, resolutions 44/144 and 44/145, both adopted without a vote, dealt respectively with the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the status of the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, in terms similar to those already contained in the two resolutions adopted earlier in the year on the same subjects by the UN Human Rights Commission.

The subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances was again addressed by a resolution which welcomed the UNHRC decision in 1988 to extend the mandate of the Working Group for 2 years and urged member states to extend their full cooperation to it. The resolution (Resolution 43/159) was adopted without a vote.

The General Assembly also considered a draft resolution introduced by the Federal Republic of Germany on elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

The proposed protocol would give parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the option of abolishing the death penalty from their legal systems. The United States did not support this draft resolution, maintaining that all states, whether or not they were parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, were already able to decide for themselves on the abolition of the death penalty; especially since the proposed second protocol was optional, it was therefore unnecessary. In the vote on the draft resolution, it was adopted by 59 votes to 26 (U.S.), with 48 abstentions. (Resolution 44/128.)

Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments

Human rights standard-setting through the drafting of conventions or declarations proceeded in four areas during 1989.

RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

A working group of the Human Rights Commission in 1979 began the work of elaborating a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child. At its 1988 session, the working group completed the first reading of the draft convention. A further 2-week session of the working group was held in November–December 1988 with a view to completing the second reading of the draft convention prior to the 45th UNHRC session, and the text of the draft convention was adopted at this working group meeting.

At the 45th session of the Commission, Poland introduced a draft resolution which adopted the draft convention as submitted by the open-ended working group and decided to transmit it through ECOSOC to the General Assembly. The resolution was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 1989/57.) Subsequently, at its first regular session of 1989, ECOSOC endorsed the Commission decision and adopted a resolution (Resolution 1989/79) which decided to submit the draft convention on the rights of the child to the 44th session of the General Assembly.

In the United Nations, 1989 represented the 30th anniversary of the Declaration on the Rights of the Child and the 10th anniversary of the International Year of the Child. At the 44th General Assembly, resolution 44/25 was adopted without a vote. This resolution formally adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was carried as an annex to the resolution text, and opened it for signature, ratification and accession. The resolution also called on the Secretary General to report at the 45th session of the General Assembly on the status of the convention.

HUMAN RIGHTS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

A working group on the drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families was established by the UN General Assembly in 1979. During 1989 the working group held sessions from May 31 to June 9 and again from September 26 to October 6, during which it continued its second reading of a heavily bracketed text.

Both the Commission and the General Assembly have been following the work of the working group with special interest. At the 45th UNHRC, a resolution once again proposed by Mexico was adopted without a vote and welcomed the progress which the working group had been making. (Resolution 1989/55.) Although the United States joined consensus, the U.S. Delegation reiterated statements made on several earlier occasions outlining the U.S. reservations about the draft convention; namely, that the International Labor Organization is the proper forum for such an endeavor and that there already existed two multilateral treaties on the rights of migrant workers (ILO Conventions 95 and 143).

By consensus, the 44th General Assembly adopted resolution 44/155 which expressed satisfaction at the progress reported by the working group and provided for a further 2-week session of the working group immediately after the first regular session of ECOSOC in 1990 to continue the second reading of the draft convention with a view to completing the remaining articles.

HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS

UN human rights bodies continued the process of drafting a document to clarify the responsibilities and rights of individuals and groups to promote human rights, a process which began with a Commission resolution in 1984 establishing an open-ended working group to draft a "Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," frequently called the "Human Rights Defenders Declaration." During 1989 sessions of the open-ended working group were held prior to and during the 45th Human Rights Commission. The Commission adopted without a vote a resolution which decided to make appropriate time available to the working group to continue its drafting prior to and during the 46th UNHRC. (Resolution 1989/60.)

At its first regular session of 1989, ECOSOC approved a resolution authorizing the open-ended working group to meet for a period of 8 working days prior to the 46th session of the Commission to continue drafting the text of the declaration. (Resolution 1989/80.)

RIGHTS OF MINORITIES

Work on a draft Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities proceeded during the 44th UNHRC session. The drafting of a declaration has been marking time until the key definition of the term minority has been supplied to the Commission by its Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In resolution 1989/61, adopted without a vote, the Commission decided to establish at its 46th session an open-ended working group to continue consideration of the revised declaration that has been proposed by Yugoslavia.

At its first regular session, ECOSOC adopted decision 1989/146, which approved the Commission decision above.

Youth and Human Rights

Following upon a decision taken by the Human Rights Commission at its 39th (1983) session, the Commission at its 41st session began the pattern of biennial consideration of an item entitled, "The Role of Youth in the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Including the Question of Conscientious

Objection to Military Service." At the 45th session of the Human Rights Commission, two resolutions were adopted under this agenda item.

The Byelorussian Delegation introduced a draft resolution on the role of youth in the promotion and protection of human rights which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/58.) Cosponsored only by other socialist countries, the resolution called on governments to take appropriate action to ensure the human rights and fundamental freedoms of youth and stressed the importance that youth places on the promotion of international peace and cooperation. Resolution 1989/59, sponsored by Spain, was also adopted without a vote and dealt with conscientious objection to military service. The resolution recognizes the right of conscientious objection and recommends that states provide various forms of non-combatant or civilian alternative service. This agenda item will again be considered by the Commission at its 47th session in 1991.

At the General Assembly, youth and human rights remains a topic considered annually. The Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution on policies and programs involving youth. (Resolution 44/59.) This resolution is discussed in the subsection on youth under the section on social development.

Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities

One of the recurring items on the Commission's annual agenda is the report of the most recent session of the Commission's Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The debate under this item consisted of a wide ranging review of the Subcommission's work, its mandate and its methods of operation. The United States, in a detailed analysis delivered by a representative of the U.S. Delegation and supported by many other delegations, noted contributions made by the Subcommission in areas such as statements on important institutional matters, for example, regarding the coordinating role of the Center for Human Rights; consideration of some human rights issues not adequately addressed by the UN system, such as, protection of the mentally ill and administrative detention without charge; and response to current human rights problems, such as, detainees and hostages in Lebanon and the unacceptable treatment of some special rapporteurs. These positive elements were at least balanced, the U.S. speaker also noted, by several disturbing aspects which offered issues for institutional reform. Among those cited was the need for the Subcommission to adhere more closely to its mandated character, that of a body of independent experts not in the employ of their governments or under instructions from those governments, and its mandated duties. Those duties consist of undertaking studies and making recommendations to the Human Rights Commission and performing any other functions entrusted to it by the Commission or ECOSOC. The U.S. speaker also noted the Subcommission's tendency to spend too much time debating political issues dealt with adequately or

best copy available

exhaustively elsewhere in the UN system. One example of the latter tendency would be a draft resolution on the movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products and wastes, an admittedly important topic but one which would be more suited to another forum such as the UN Environment Program. Another cited area for improvement was the need for greater attention to the financial implications of unnecessary and wasteful studies or other projects undertaken by the Subcommission, many of which are then referred to the Center for Human Rights or highly paid consultants for completion.

The review of the work of the Subcommission culminated in the adoption without a vote of resolution 1989/36, introduced by the Federal Republic of Germany and other cosponsors, which, in several operative paragraphs, sought to draw together the principal points of the discussion and call these points to the attention of the Subcommission. In other provisions the resolution emphasized the expert nature of the work which the Subcommission was to perform and proposed measures to bring the Subcommission's study program into better balance with the Commission's needs. The resolution followed on a similar measure adopted by the 44th session of the Commission (Resolution 1988/43) and constituted another step toward strengthening the oversight role of the Commission over the Subcommission.

The debate on the Subcommission's report also covered several resolutions, some of which the Subcommission had forwarded to the Commission for action and others of which were proposed by Commission members on topics covered in the Subcommission's report. The Commission approved without a vote a resolution which expressed general support for the work being carried out by the Subcommission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations and urged the working group to continue and complete as soon as possible a set of draft international standards based on a continued and comprehensive review of developments pertaining to the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous populations. (Resolution 1989/34.)

The Commission also endorsed resolution 1989/35 proposed by Belgium on the subject of slavery and slavery-like practices. The resolution, adopted without a vote, contained general provisions which highlighted the existence in the world today of certain slavery-like practices and contained recommendations to governments designed to cope with these situations. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to designate the Center for Human Rights as the focal point for coordination of UN activities for the suppression of contemporary forms of slavery. In light of the adoption of this Belgian proposal, the Commission decided to take no action on a draft resolution on this subject which had been recommended by the Subcommission.

Resolution 1989/37, introduced by the Federal Republic of Germany, dealt with the status of special rapporteurs, citing in particular Mr. Dumitri Mazilu, a Romanian, who had been appointed by the Subcommission in 1985 as Special

pages tightly bound

Rapporteur on Human Rights and Youth but who had been prevented by the Government of Romania from the performance of his mandated duties. The draft resolution stressed the importance of privileges and immunities for special rapporteurs. At the request of the East German Delegation, a roll-call vote was taken and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 26 (U.S.) to 5, with 12 abstentions.

Resolution 1989/41 dealt with proposed studies on treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements between states and indigenous populations and recommended that ECOSOC endorse the proposal. In an explanation of position, the U.S. Delegation stated that it would not participate in consideration of this resolution, and the resolution was adopted without a vote.

The Commission approved without a vote a resolution proposed by Belgium which noted the report prepared by the expert of the Subcommission on the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his own country. The resolution expressed the Commission's interest in the Subcommission's continued processing of a declaration on this subject. (Resolution 1989/39.) The Commission also adopted without a vote resolutions on the question of administrative detention without charge or trial (Resolution 1989/38), on protection of the rights of the mentally ill (Resolution 1989/40), on the movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products and wastes (Resolution 1989/42), and on the use of computerized personal files. (Resolution 1989/43.)

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted a resolution commending the Subcommission's Working Group on Slavery for its examination of contemporary forms of slavery and endorsing the Commission's recommendation that the Secretary General designate the Center for Human Rights as the focus for UN activities regarding this topic. (Resolution 1989/74.) ECOSOC also adopted resolutions endorsing Commission decisions on the subjects of the status of special rapporteurs (Resolution 1989/75), principles for the protection of persons detained on the grounds of mental ill health (Resolution 1989/76), the question of a convention on the rights of the child (Resolution 1989/79), and guidelines on the use of computerized personal files (Resolution 1989/78). In addition, ECOSOC resolution 1989/77 confirmed the appointment of a Special Rapporteur on Indigenous Populations and authorized a study on whether treaties concluded between indigenous populations and governments protect the former's human rights.

Violations of Human Rights

The recurring item on the Commission's annual agenda which relates to violations of human rights in any part of the world again occupied a major part of the Commission's time at its 44th session. A sub-item concerns human rights situations, in particular countries brought to the Commission's attention under the confidential procedures established by ECOSOC resolution 1503 (XLVIII)

The Commission took up in private sessions the human rights situations in eight cases (Brunei Darussalam, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Paraguay, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zaire). The Commission decided to drop consideration of Honduras, Iraq, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zaire.

The public debate under the violations agenda item was, as usual, marked by general statements by a large number of the Commission members surveying the state of human rights throughout the world. Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, explained the concerns of the U.S. Government over negative human rights developments in South Africa, Albania, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, the U.S.S.R., Cyprus, Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Chile, East Timor, Burma, Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan. He stated the basic position of the United States by saying, "Human rights and fundamental freedoms limit the power and authority of the state, in relation to the individual. When a state transgresses those limits, it is the right and duty of the world to call attention to such abuses."

In public session, the Commission adopted several resolutions dealing with separate country situations. A resolution on the situation in southern Lebanon was proposed by Morocco with a number of Arab and Soviet cosponsors. The draft resolution expressed grave concern over Israeli action in southern Lebanon, strongly condemned human rights violations by Israel, called on Israel to put an immediate end to repressive practices and to release detained and abducted persons. The resolution did not, however, refer to the presence of other foreign troops in Lebanon nor to the responsibility of the various Lebanese factions and militias for the country's turmoil. In a roll-call vote request by the United States, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 30 to 1 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/65.)

Concerning human rights in Iran, the Commission heard the report of the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Reynaldo Galindo Pohl. The Commission also considered a draft resolution cosponsored by several Western countries. The resolution noted "the appreciation expressed by the special representative for the cooperation of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran . . . " and expressed "the hope that this cooperation will reach the level of full cooperation in the near future, including visits by the special representative to . . . Iran, so that he can fulfil his mandate . . . . It expressed deep concern at the number and gravity of violations of human rights in Iran, including the situation of minority groups such as the Baha'is as indicated in the special rapporteur's report, urged the Government of Iran to respect the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to which it is a state party, and extended the rapporteur's mandate for another year. The resolution on the human rights situation in Iran was adopted by a vote of 20 (U.S.) to 6, with 12 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/66.)

A number of Western states introduced a draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Iraq. The draft resolution expressed the Commission's grave concern at reports of the killing of unarmed Kurdish civilians and the use of chemical weapons, and requested the Chairman of the Commission to appoint a special rapporteur to make a thorough study of the human rights situation in Iraq. The Representative of Iraq moved that the Commission take no decision on this draft resolution, and this motion of no action was adopted by 17 votes to 13 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions.

Regarding the situation of human rights in Burma, the Commission Chairman introduced a draft decision which noted the cooperation the Burmese authorities had provided to special rapporteurs and their undertaking to organize free and fair multiparty elections, urging the authorities to implement their undertaking as early as possible to assure the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Burma. This draft decision was adopted by the Commission without a vote.

Special Rapporteur Mr. Felix Ermacora presented his report to the Commission of the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Afghanistan. A draft resolution, introduced by Italy and cosponsored by several other Western nations, welcomed the completion of withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan but reviewed allegations of continuing human rights violations. It called on all parties to work for a comprehensive political solution which would permit the full enjoyment of human rights by the Afghan people, and extended the mandate of the special rapporteur for another year. The draft resolution was approved without a vote as resolution 1989/67.

Following a report by the special representative on human rights in El Salvador, Colombia introduced a draft resolution cosponsored by several other Latin American states which was adopted without a vote. The resolution, in addition to extending the mandate of the special representative, presented a relatively balanced description of the situation in El Salvador.

Two final country-specific resolutions on human rights involved Albania and Romania. Portugal introduced a draft resolution cosponsored by the United States and other Western nations noting that although the human rights situation in Albania had been under consideration by the Human Rights Commission since 1984, the Government of Albania had not responded to allegations of human rights violations. The resolution reminded Albania of its obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to extend its full cooperation to the Commission and decided to continue consideration of this question at the 46th meeting of the UNHRC. In a roll-call vote, the resolution was adopted as resolution 1989/69 by a vote of 23 (U.S.) to 3, with 13 abstentions. Those members opposing the resolution were China, Cuba and Pakistan.

Sweden and four Western cosponsors introduced the draft resolution on the human rights situation in Romania, which requested the Commission's Chairman to appoint a special rapporteur on this subject to report at the 46th Commission session. At the request of Cuba, a roll-call vote was conducted and the resolution was adopted by 21 (U.S.) to 7, with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 1989/75.)

In addition to the foregoing country-specific resolutions, the Commission adopted two resolutions dealing with human rights problems in general. A resolution proposed by nine cosponsors, approved without a vote, concerned the subject of human rights and mass exoduses. This resolution, 1989/63, was another in a series of resolutions which have expressed the Commission's continuing concern over this problem. The Commission also approved without a vote a resolution proposed by several Western cosponsors concerning the continuing problem of summary or arbitrary executions in various parts of the world. The text of resolution 1989/64 was based upon a report submitted to the Commission by its Special Rapporteur, Mr. S. Amos Wako, and encouraged broader governmental cooperation with his efforts.

The first regular session of ECOSOC approved resolution 1989/65, "Effective prevention and investigation of extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions." An annex provided principles for such prevention and investigation, and the resolution requested the Secretary General to ensure that the principles be included in the UN document entitled "Human Rights: A Compendium of International Instruments."

ECOSOC also approved the Commission request to appoint a special rapporteur on Romania (Decision 1989/154) and approved the extension of the mandates of the special rapporteurs for Chile (Decision 1989/147) and Afghanistan (Decision 1989/149) and the special representatives for Iran (Decision 1989/148) and El Salvador. (Decision 1989/151.)

The 44th General Assembly considered country-specific resolutions on the human rights situations in four countries, Iran, Afghanistan, El Salvador and Chile.

After several years of opposition to an investigatory visit by the UN special representative on the human rights situation in Iran, the Government of Iran during the 44th General Assembly presented the Chairman of the General Assembly with a formal invitation to the Special Representative, Mr. Reynaldo Galindo Pohl. Based upon this invitation, the Chairman introduced a short, noncondemnatory draft resolution which noted the invitation and called on the Government of Iran to give all necessary assistance to the special representative. This draft was adopted without a vote to become resolution 44/163. The United States concurred in this resolution in an effort to gain entry into Iran for the special rapporteur.

Resolution 44/161 on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan was also adopted without a vote. The resolution welcomed the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan but noted the continuing acts of terrorism and violations of human rights in that country. It urged all parties to the conflict in Afghanistan to work for the achievement of a comprehensive political solution which would permit the return of refugees and the full enjoyment of human rights by all Afghans, and it decided to continue the consideration of human rights in Afghanistan at the 45th General Assembly.

The human rights situation in El Salvador was the subject of resolution 44/165, which was adopted without a vote. The resolution urged that dialogue between the Government of El Salvador and the antigovernment forces be renewed and called for all other states to refrain from intervening in the internal situation there.

A draft resolution on human rights and mass exoduses was proposed in terms similar to those contained in the resolution of the Human Rights Commission adopted earlier in the year and called for continued attention to the problem of mass exoduses of refugees and displaced persons, including its root causes. The resolution, 44/164, was adopted without a vote. The General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on summary or arbitrary executions (Resolution 44/159) and a resolution on the question of enforced or involuntary disappearances. (Resolution 44/160.) Finally, the General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 44/156, which called on the Secretary General to seek the views of governments, specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations and others regarding the desirability of holding a world conference on human rights.

Human Rights in Chile

Unlike other country situations that were considered by the Human Rights Commission at its 45th session under the item relating to human rights violations in any part of the world, the question of human rights in Chile was again considered under a separate agenda item. In accordance with the practice of many previous sessions, Mexico joined with other cosponsors in presenting a draft resolution. The resolution was orally amended from the floor so that it more objectively reflected the positive steps taken by the Chilean Government and was adopted without a vote. The resolution also extended for 1 year the mandate of the special rapporteur on human rights in Chile. (Resolution 1989/62.)

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, the Commission's decision to extend the mandate of its special rapporteur on Chile for 1 year was approved without a vote. (Decision 1989/147.)

At the 44th UN General Assembly, a draft resolution on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile was again proposed by

Mexico, in company with other cosponsors. The General Assembly had before it a report from the special rapporteur. The resolution congratulated the people of Chile on their progress toward reestablishing democracy but regretted the decision of the Government of Chile to discontinue cooperation with the special rapporteur. It was approved by a vote of 84 to 2, with 60 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 44/166.) While the United States abstained, it did note that the resolution made substantial progress in presenting a more balanced picture of the human rights situation in Chile.

Advisory Services

Under the Human Rights Advisory Services Program, which is based upon General Assembly resolution 926 (X) adopted in 1955, the Secretary General reports annually to the Human Rights Commission. His report covers three aspects of the program: advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships and seminars. At the 45th session of the Human Rights Commission, five resolutions were adopted under the Advisory Services item. A general resolution, proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of a number of cosponsors, was designed to record the Commission's continuing interest in this program; the resolution's operative paragraphs encouraged the Secretary General to promote activities under the program. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1989/72.) The Commission also adopted without a vote, resolution 1989/71 on the Voluntary Fund for Advisory Services and Technical Assistance in the Field of Human Rights. In resolution 1989/74, adopted without a vote, the Commission expressed appreciation for the report submitted by the expert on the services he provided to Guatemala and extended his mandate for 1 year. The Commission also adopted without a vote, resolution 1989/73, noting the report of the expert providing services to Haiti and extending his mandate for 1 year. Finally, in resolution 1989/70, adopted without a vote, the Commission took note of a report submitted by an expert provided under the advisory services program to the Government of Equatorial Guinea. The Government of Equatorial Guinea was requested to give appropriate consideration to implementing the plan of action proposed by the Advisory Services Program.

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted decisions approving the extension of the mandates of the experts for Guatemala (Decision 1989/153) and Haiti (Decision 1989/152) and endorsing the Commission resolution on Equatorial Guinea. (Decision 1989/151.)

Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination

This agenda item, the full title of which is "Measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, including Nazi, fascist and neofascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights, or fundamental freedoms or which have such consequences," has traditionally been of special interest to Communist countries. The item appears on the agenda biennially and was considered by the UNHRC at its 44th (1988) session, and so did not appear on the Commission agenda for the 45th session.

Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights

A recurring item on the agenda of the Human Rights Commission concerns the status of the International Covenants on Human Rights, which is the subject of an annual report to the Commission submitted by the Secretary General. At its 45th session the Commission considered four draft resolutions under this topic, all of which were approved without a vote. A draft resolution presented by Sweden and other cosponsors made a general appeal for more states to become parties to the covenants and urged governments to give the widest possible distribution to the texts of these covenants. (Resolution 1989/17.) The Byelorussian S.S.R. and two other socialist states sponsored resolution 1989/16 on the status of the Genocide Convention. On the initiative of the Delegation of Italy, the Commission adopted resolution 1989/46 on reporting obligations of states parties to international instruments on human rights. Resolution 1989/47, introduced by Canada, dealt with effective functioning of bodies established pursuant to UN human rights instruments.

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted a resolution calling for states to ratify the International Covenants (Resolution 1989/81) and two decisions on reporting obligations (Decision 1989/142) and effective functioning of bodies. (Decision 1989/143.)

The 44th UN General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution which again urged governments to become parties to the covenants and to support actively their implementation mechanisms. (Resolution 44/129.) The 44th General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution dealing with reporting obligations of states parties to UN conventions on human rights. The resolution was based on an earlier report submitted by the Secretary General which addressed the growing problem of the failure of states parties to various UN conventions to comply in a timely manner with their reporting obligations under these conventions. In its operative paragraphs, the resolution drew attention to this problem and exhorted governments to improve compliance with their reporting obligations. A number of measures to assist states in carrying out their reporting obligations were also put forward. (Resolution 44/135.) In addition, the General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution on the status of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide urging states that had not already done so to ratify the convention. (Resolution 44/158.)

Regional Arrangements

Carrying forth its interest in promoting the establishment of regional institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights in the Asian-Pacific Region, the Commission at its 45th session adopted without a vote a draft resolution proposed by the Delegation of the Philippines and cosponsored by five other Asian-Pacific countries. The Secretary General was requested, in cooperation with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, and governments of the region, to continue his efforts toward the establishment of a depository center in Bangkok for UN human rights materials. The Secretary General was requested to report on the matter to the 46th Commission session. (Resolution 1989/50.)

The 44th General Assembly did not take up the question of regional arrangements, since the matter is on the General Assembly agenda biennially and was considered by the 43rd General Assembly.

Science and Technology

The issue of science and technology in the area of human rights is considered biennially by the UN Human Rights Commission, ECOSOC and the General Assembly. The Human Rights Commission considered this topic at its 44th session in 1988 and thus did not address it at the 45th session.

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted resolution 1989/47 on social welfare, development and science and technology, which stressed the importance of science and technology to the implementation of fundamental social rights.

The 44th session of the General Assembly considered three resolutions, adopting each without a vote. The first, resolution 44/133, was a general reiteration of the use of the achievements of science and technology in benefit of all people. The second, resolution 44/134, dealt with the need for guidelines on the protection of persons detained on the grounds of mental illness. In the draft resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed its conviction that detention of persons in mental institutions on account of their political views or on other nonmedical grounds is a violation of human rights. The resolution urged the Human Rights Commission to consider the subject at its 46th session with a view to submitting a set of draft guidelines, principles and guarantees to the 45th session of the General Assembly. The third draft resolution encouraged further progress in drafting of guidelines for the regulation of computerized personal data files. (Resolution 44/132.)

Enlargement of the Human Rights Commission

In an initiative by members of the non-aligned movement, the 44th General Assembly was presented with a draft resolution on the enlargement of the UN

Human Rights Commission. The draft resolution cited the final documents of the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries adopted at Belgrade on September 7, 1989, which called for an overall review of the current distribution of membership in various UN bodies and commissions with a view to achieving a more equitable geographical distribution. The operative paragraphs called on ECOSOC to take action on this matter at its first regular session of 1990 and requested the Commission to examine ways and means of making its work more effective. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 151 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 2 abstentions by Japan and Zaire. (Resolution 44/167.)

Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

The 41st session of the Commission's Expert Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was held in Geneva from August 7 to September 1. The 26-member Subcommission is composed of experts who act in their individual capacity, and who in theory do not involve the responsibility of the governments of the states of which they are nationals. The Subcommission reports to its parent body, the Human Rights Commission.

At its 41st session, the Subcommission dealt with an agenda which in recent years has become increasingly crowded and adopted 47 resolutions and 13 decisions. One feature of the Subcommission's work program which has been of increasing concern to the Commission in recent years has been the Subcommission's growing pattern of reports and studies which are under preparation by various individual Subcommission members. Its 41st sessional report showed that 21 such studies and reports were at various stages of preparation. Of these, 14 were scheduled for final report to the 42nd (1990) meeting of the Subcommission.

Several of the reports represented subjects of particular interest to the United States. The American expert member of the Subcommission, Judge William Treat, is working with the Soviet expert to prepare a report on the right to a fair trial. Other reports or studies of note involve a report on human rights of detained juveniles, a revised report on administrative detention, a working paper on monitoring respect for the independence of the judiciary, and a study on the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

During the 40 meetings held by the Subcommission during its 41st session, the Subcommission also prepared 14 draft resolutions and four draft decisions to be referred to the Human Rights Commission at its 46th (1990) session. The draft resolutions included such topics as the right to freedom of opinion and expression, prevention of the sale of children and of child prostitution and pornography, and compensation for victims of gross violations of human rights. Among the draft decisions referred to the Human Rights Commission were items on traditional practices affecting the health of women and children, the role of the Subcommission in measures to combat racism and racial discrimination, and a draft universal declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples.

Along with the Subcommission's activities in developing expert recommendations and standards with respect to the various subjects under study, the Subcommission also devoted much of its time to a discussion of a number of resolutions which emphasize the more political and less expert side of the Subcommission's work. The Subcommission adopted resolutions or decisions relating to the situation of human rights and freedoms in South Africa, China, Guatemala, East Timor, Lebanon, El Salvador, Iran, Iraq and the territories occupied by Israel. The Subcommission also passed resolutions on discrimination against HIV-infected people or people with AIDS, traditional practices affecting the health of women and children, the elimination of chemical weapons out of respect for the right to life, the relocation of Hopi and Navajo families and toxic wastes. The Subcommission passed a resolution calling for the protection of UN staff members who have been detained by member states and a further resolution on the prevention of hostage-taking.

In closed sessions, the Subcommission dealt with recommendations of its presessional Working Group on Communications. This standing working group was established under ECOSOC resolution 1503 (XLVIII) to screen the thousands of human rights communications received each year by the United Nations from NGOs and individuals. The working group's task is to identify for the full Subcommission situations appearing to reveal a consistent pattern of gross and reliably attested violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Subcommission noted with satisfaction that there was a growing willingness of governments to respond to Subcommission inquiries directed at them regarding the allegations in these human rights communications. The Subcommission decided to refer several of the situations it had examined to the Commission for consideration.

Status of Women

Women's issues took on increasing importance in a series of UN meetings during 1989. The focus of much of the discussion, as in the previous year, was the ability of the United Nations to implement the consensus final document of the Nairobi World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, held at Nairobi, Kenya in 1985.

That document, known as the Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, was the basis for a major effort to enhance the effectiveness of UN machinery and programs for the advancement of women. The Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) played the central role in promoting the implementation of these strategies. The importance of the total integration of women in the development process, mindful of the specific and urgent needs of the developing countries, was emphasized. Largely through U.S. efforts, the status of women in the UN Secretariat improved, and a senior-level officer was appointed as the focal point for implementation.

The single most important UN event in 1989 impacting on women's issues was the CSW enlargement voted by ECOSOC. Although opposed by all except the G–77, enlargement carried the day. The United States did not accept the expansion vote as a precedent for other UN bodies.

Maureen Reagan, the U.S. Representative to the CSW at the beginning of the year, played a key role in the CSW session. Her successor, Juliette Clagett McLennan, then took the helm, continuing in the tradition of active and positive U.S. participation in women's issues.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The 33rd session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) was held in Vienna March 29–April 7.

Thirty-one of the 32 CSW member states attended. Twenty-eight other UN members and three non-UN members sent observers as did the UN Secretariat, other UN bodies and specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, national liberation movements and nongovernmental organizations.

The Commission elected Johanna Dohnal (Austria) as chairperson; Wang Shuxian (China), Sonia Martinez (Columbia), and Dagmar Molkova (Czechoslovakia) as vice-chairpersons; and Assumani Ussu Bagbeni (Zaire) as rapporteur.

This session was the second conducted under the reformed agenda adopted at the CSW special session in New York in January 1987. At that time it was agreed that the next five sessions of the CSW would discuss priority themes based upon each of the three Forward-looking Strategies of the Nairobi World Conference. The 1989 themes were:

— Equality: Equality in economic and social participation;

— Development: Women and education, eradication of illiteracy, employment, health and social services, including population issues and child care;

— Peace: Full participation of women in the construction of their countries and in the creation of just, social and political systems.

The major agenda items were: programming and coordination matters related to the United Nations and the UN system; monitoring the implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies; discussion of priority themes; and expansion of the CSW.

Under the programming and coordination agenda item, the Commission passed a resolution by consensus on Program Planning and Activities to Advance the Status of Women which seeks, *inter alia*, to enhance the treatment of women's issues both in the program budget for the biennium 1990–1991 as well as in subsequent budgets.

Under the agenda item on monitoring the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, the Commission decided in a resolution on preparations for the 1990 CSW extended session that a comprehensive report on the progress achieved and the obstacles encountered in implementing the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies in the first 5 years, as well as draft recommendations, should be submitted to that session by the Secretary General.

The Commision on the Status of Women adopted a resolution on the 10th anniversary of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women urging parties to the Convention to make all possible efforts to submit their initial implementation reports.

The CSW also adopted a resolution on "Women and children in Namibia" requesting the Secretary General to submit a comprehensive report on the implementation and monitoring of the Forward-looking Strategies in regard to women and children there.

The United States opposed adoption of the resolution on "Women and children under apartheid" (25 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions) because its polemical and condemnatory tone did not further the goal of changing the apartheid system.

The United States voted "no" on the resolution on the "Situation of Palestinian women" (19 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions). This unbalanced resolution, which singled out Israel for condemnation, requested the Secretary General to send a mission of experts to investigate the condition of women and children in the occupied territories.

Thirteen resolutions were introduced under the agenda item on the priority themes. All but one were passed by consensus: the exception was the resolution on "Women and development" (21 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions). The United States voted against this resolution because it did not deal with the economic problems caused by inappropriate domestic policies in developing countries and by capital flight. Furthermore, its references to the servicing of external debt and the effects of on-going structural adjustment were unbalanced.

The United States was able to substantially moderate the resolution on the Economic Situation of Women in Latin America and the Caribbean in regard to debt servicing and thus join consensus.

The United States joined consensus on the resolution on "Women living in absolute poverty" but stated that General Assembly resolution 43/195, to which the CSW resolution referred, placed undue emphasis on the potential negative effects of structural adjustment programs. The United States favors well targeted compensatory measures to help shield the poor from adverse effects and believes a failure to adjust would be far more damaging to them in the long term.

In its final meeting the 33rd session of the CSW took up the question of the enlargement of the Commission on the Status of Women. However, the CSW members could not reach a consensus on whether or how to expand the Commission. A resolution which proposed the issue be taken up at the 34th CSW session was introduced. However, it was defeated (13 (U.S.) to 15, with 2 abstentions). The defeat of the resolution meant that ECOSOC would decide the question of expansion at its May 1989 session.

In all, the CSW dealt with 23 resolutions and decisions. The United States joined consensus on 19 of them. It voted against three which were adopted and for one which was defeated. The United States introduced the resolution (with 15 cosponsors) on the "Status of women in the Secretariat." The United States was successful in the redrafting of "Women and children in Namibia," which was then adopted by consensus. While the United States maintained close contact with the G-77, it was not always possible to moderate their views as evinced by the resolutions on "Palestinian women," "Women and children under apartheid," and "Women and development," all of which the United States found it necessary to vote against.

FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF ECOSOC

The Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council considered the question of the advancement of women (agenda item 10) at its first regular session of 1989 in New York, May 2–24.

The report of the Commission on the Status of Women recommended 23 draft resolutions and decisions to ECOSOC, which adopted all of them, 19 by consensus and 4 by vote.

The Committee had before it the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women on its 8th session (February 20–March 3), the report of the CSW on its 33rd session (March 29–April 7), the note by the Secretary General on a draft system-wide medium-term plan for the advancement of women for 1996–2001 and the report of the

Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) on its 9th session (February 20–24).

ECOSOC voted to enlarge the CSW from 32 to 45 member states, doing so by 35 to 19 (U.S.), with no abstentions. The 35 affirmative votes came from the entire G–77; the negative votes were from the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) and the Eastern European States. This marked the first time such an action had been taken over the opposition of two regional groups. The 13 additional seats were determined to be distributed as follows: 5 for Africa, 5 for Asia, 3 for Latin America and none for WEOG or the Eastern European States. In explaining its vote in plenary, the United States underlined the divisiveness of ECOSOC's action and noted that there was no correlation between the CSW's expansion and a sincere desire to improve the lives of women. The United States further stated that it did not accept the expansion vote as a precedent for other UN bodies.

The United States voted against the resolution on "Women and children under apartheid" (44 to 2 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions) because it called for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

The United States voted "no" on the resolution on the "Situation of Palestinian women" (38 to 1 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions) because of its lack of balance toward Israel.

The United States opposed the resolution on "Women and development" (40 to 1 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions) because it not only implied that servicing external debt was the primary cause for slow economic development, an implication the United States does not accept, but also overlooked the main cause: inappropriate domestic economic policies in developing countries.

SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF ECOSOC

The First (Economic) Committee considered the question of women and development (agenda item 7(i)) during the 2nd regular session of ECOSOC for 1989 in Geneva, July 5–28.

The Committee had before it the report of the Secretary General on the effective mobilization and integration of women in development (including an extract of the world survey on the role of women in development); the report of the Administrative Committee on Coordination on UN system implementation of the system-wide medium-term plan for women in development (1990–1995); the report of the 33rd CSW containing the draft resolution on system-wide coordination of activities to advance the status of women and to integrate women in development; and the report of the Secretary General on the cross-organizational program analysis of the activities of the UN system for the advancement of women.

On the theme on women and development, the U.S. Representative strongly supported the integration of women in development, indicating the emphasis the United States would place on the issue in the 34th CSW. In concluding his remarks, the U.S. Representative stated:

> We see an encouraging trend toward political liberalization and free market-oriented solutions to the problems of economic growth. So many countries around the world today have recognized the need for greater openness and economic restructuring. The challenge posed by our times ultimately is not to nations or corporations or societies, but to the individual human imagination. It is our desire that women shall play a concrete and effective role in meeting that challenge.

The United States cosponored and joined consensus on a resolution on "Effective mobilization and integration of women in development," which essentially called for more UN system-wide planning.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

During the 44th UN General Assembly issues of special significance for women were taken up by the UN General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial), Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural), and Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committees.

Nine resolutions were introduced. All were adopted by consensus. In joining consensus on the Second Committee resolution on Integration of Women in Development (Resolution 44/171), the U.S. Representative, Juliette Clagett McLennan, stated in part:

> The United States agrees with the view contained in the policy action section of the survey (1989 World Survey on the Role of Women in Development) which states that the negative effects of the economic crisis affecting some developing countries should be redressed by policies aimed at restoring growth. Equally as important, public policy should be used to facilitate women's full participation in both the public and private sector.

The Third Committee considered seven resolutions, which were all adopted by consensus. Under item 94, resolution 44/60 "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women" commended the work of INSTRAW and invited contributions. Under item 103, resolution 44/73 "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women" called upon states to ratify CEDAW. Under item 104, resolution 44/74 "UN Development Fund for Women" commended the work of UNIFEM and invited contributions. Resolution 44/76 "Elderly women" reaffirmed an ECOSOC resolution to convene a "Seminar" on elderly women. Resolution 44/77 "Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women" was an amalgam of requests for action to improve the status of women worldwide. Resolution 44/78 "Improvement of the status of women in rural areas" called upon states to take measures to improve the situation of rural women.

The United States introduced a resolution under item 104 entitled "Improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat." (Resolution 44/75.) It noted the deployment of a senior-level officer as the focal point for women in the Secretariat and requested the Secretary General to intensify his efforts to increase the number of women employed throughout the UN system, particularly in the senior policy-level and decision making posts, in order to achieve an overall participation rate of women of 30 percent by 1990.

The Fifth Committee adopted a similar resolution under item 130 (Resolution 44/185) on "Personnel questions" adding that in reaching this goal the principle of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity with full respect for equitable geographical distribution should be taken into account.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE IAEA

UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

INTRODUCTION

The UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) was created as an autonomous organization within the UN Secretariat by General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI) of 1966 and became an independent specialized agency of the United Nations on January 1, 1986. Its mandate is to promote and accelerate industrial development in developing countries, and to promote industrial cooperation and development on global, regional, national and sectoral levels.

Membership in UNIDO is open to all members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the IAEA, or to states approved for membership by a two-thirds majority of those members present at a General Conference. In 1989 UNIDO had a membership of 151 states, following Australia's decision to withdraw its membership as of December 31, 1988. The United States has participated in UNIDO since its inception.

UNIDO, whose headquarters is in Vienna, has three principal organs. The General Conference, which all member states may attend, meets biennially and provides broad policy guidance for the organization. The 53-member Industrial Development Board (IDB), according to a Board decision made in 1989 and for a 4-year trial period, now meets twice in non-General Conference years and once in Conference years. The 27-member Program and Budget Committee (PBC) meets annually. Members of the IDB and the PBC are elected at the General Conference, usually from consensus slates agreed upon by four regional groupings.*

UNIDO MEETINGS

The United States sent delegations to the four major meetings convened by UNIDO in 1989, all of which met in Vienna: the 5th session of the Program and Budget Committee (April 10–14), the 5th session of the Industrial Development Board (June 27–July 6), the Third General Conference (November 20–24), and the third special session of the Industrial Development Board (November 24).

ACTIVITIES IN 1989

Program and Budget Committee

In its 5th session, the PBC approved the 1990/91 biennial budget proposed by Director General Domingo L. Siazon (Philippines) of $189.6 million, a budget representing negative real growth from the 1988/89 biennium, as directed by the Second General Conference. After considerable debate, the Committee endorsed the Director General's proposal for a three-part implementation of recommendations from an internal management review, which had been commissioned by the 1988 IDB and written by a team headed by the American Deputy Director General for Administration, Louis R. Faoro. As part of the first implementation phase, a Strategy, Policy, and Planning Office, located in the office of the Director General, was established in August 1989.

The Committee also recommended special programs for Africa, and for regional cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean, and in East Asia and the Pacific, to be financed via reallocation of existing budget resources. The Committee adopted most of the recommendations of an expert committee on the respective roles of, and interaction between, the regular (financed by member assessments) and operational (financed by voluntary contributions) budgets. The PBC also completed its rules of procedure by accepting draft decisions on the plurality necessary to adopt decisions and on the role of observers.

---

* The Third General Conference elected 27 new members to 4-year terms on the IDB, and all 27 members of the 2-year-term PBC. Membership in each body as of December 1989:

IDB: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia and Zaire.

PBC: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Libya, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States, U.S.S.R., Venezuela and Zambia.

Industrial Development Board

The Industrial Development Board passed and sent to the General Conference a record 39 consensus decisions, including the PBC budget resolution and a recommendation for the reappointment of Director General Siazon. There were roll call votes on two issues. The United States joined the majority (37 (U.S.) to 2, with 7 abstentions) in support of a resolution on UNIDO's organization and staff structure, which approved the Director General's implementation of the first part of the management review findings and asked for further consultations on the remaining two parts.

The U.S. Delegation called for a vote on a resolution concerning external debt and industrial development, which was passed by a vote of 46 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. In a statement to the Board, U.S. Alternate Representative Norman Frisbie said the resolution did not present a balanced analysis of economic problems affecting developing countries, and gave a misleading picture of the role UNIDO could play.

In other decisions, the Board recommended that the decade 1991–2000 be proclaimed the Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa (IDDA), and asked that, within existing financial resources, UNIDO establish a special program for the Arab countries of the Middle East.

Third General Conference

The Third General Conference, as did its predecessor Second Conference (Bangkok, 1987), completed its work in four and one half days rather than the full five alloted. In his statement to the plenary meeting, U.S. Head of Delegation Ambassador Michael Newlin underlined U.S. support for UNIDO's efforts in privatization activities, the program and planning budget effort, and adoption of the recommendations on organization and structure outlined in the management review.

The Conference adopted 31 decisions and 22 resolutions, many of them recommended by the PBC and IDB (such as the three new regional programs, and the declaration of the second IDDA), and many concerned with perennial topics such as human resource development and technical assistance to various groups. All were approved by consensus, except, as noted, two resolutions—external debt and technical assistance to the Palestinian people—on which the U.S. Delegation called for a recorded vote.

External Debt. In a statement following the vote on the resolution on external debt and its effect on development (101 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions), Ambassador Newlin noted that

> . . . in recent years, there has been a proliferation of discussions on debt and negotiations of debt resolutions in UN bodies, such as UNIDO, that, in our view, have neither the legal mandate nor the technical expertise to address this issue . . . . We oppose any attempt to expand (UNIDO's) mandate in the debt area.

Technical Assistance to the Palestinian People. A resolution calling for UNIDO to " . . . sustain and increase its technical assistance to the Palestinian people in close cooperation with the Palestine National Liberation Organization . . . " was passed by a vote of 95 to 2 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. Ambassador Newlin noted that the United States supports continued UNIDO technical assistance to the Palestinian people, just as it supports humanitarian assistance to them through UNRWA, but that the U.S. Delegation could not support the resolution because of its implicit recognition of the PLO as a governing entity.

Other important resolutions include those on:

Environment. The Conference gave partial approval to the Director General's plan to assure environmental factors are integrated into all aspects of UNIDO's work. Some delegates expressed concern that environmental considerations not become an obstacle to development and development projects. There was, however, widespread support for increased staff training and a strengthened UNIDO advisory role in environmental matters, as many UNIDO projects involve basic industries which have potentially major environmental impact.

IPS Guidelines. With some changes, the Conference approved guidelines for the functioning of the Investment Promotion Service (IPS) offices detailed in the Director General's report. At present, the nine IPS offices* are charged with encouraging outward investment from the host country to the developing world, and are financed by the host country. The revised guidelines would permit the establishment of IPS offices in developing countries with a mixed mandate to promote industrial investment to other developing countries as well as promoting inward investment to the host country. Although UNIDO is encouraged to arrange extrabudgetary funding for any new IPS offices in the developing world, those offices are expected to be fully financed by the home countries, just as the offices in the developed world are funded.

The Medium-Term Plan. For the 1990–1995 period, UNIDO's efforts are to focus on five priority problem areas: human resources development, the development and transfer of technology, small- and medium-scale industries, industrial rehabilitation, and environment and energy issues. Special attention is to be paid to the integration of women in development, economic cooperation between developing countries, and mobilizing financial resources for development efforts.

---

* Current IPS offices are located in Cologne, Milan, Paris, Seoul, Tokyo, Vienna, Warsaw, Washington, D.C. and Zurich.

The Conference also confirmed Director General Siazon's election to a second 4-year term of office.

Industrial Development Board: Third Special Session

In a half-day meeting at the close of the Third General Conference, the Industrial Development Board (IDB) approved a draft agenda for its May 28–June 1, 1990 sixth session, and tentative agendas for the 7th (fall 1990) and 8th (spring 1991) sessions. It also endorsed the Director General's appointment of Leonid Soumarokov (U.S.S.R.) to a 1-year term as Deputy Director General for Industrial Operations.

INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICE

The Washington, D.C., UNIDO Investment Promotion Service office (IPS) was established to promote joint ventures and investment in the developing world. The Washington IPS deals directly with the U.S. private sector at the level of industry associations, state and regional development groups, chambers of commerce, individual firms and attempts to match potential investors with appropriate, viable projects. It also works closely with the Department of Commerce, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Department of State and other U.S. Government agencies. In 1989 the United States contributed $250,000 to the Washington IPS office through a voluntary contribution.

World Bank Group

The World Bank Group is composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). As a member of the UN system and as a development finance institution, the World Bank works with the United Nations and its various specialized agencies in a wide variety of activities. During the Bank Group's Fiscal Year 1989 (FY 1989 ended June 30, 1989), 151 nations were members of the IBRD, 137 belonged to IDA and 133 were members of the IFC. Seventy-three countries had signed the convention establishing MIGA by June 20, 1989, and 52 have also ratified it.

The Bank fosters economic growth in its member countries by providing loans, either at near-commercial terms (IBRD) or at highly concessional terms (IDA), for sound development projects. The Bank traditionally has financed all types of capital infrastructure, but in 1980 it inaugurated a program of adjustment lending to support specific policy changes and institutional reforms in developing countries. Adjustment lending accounted for 39 percent of total IBRD/IDA lending in FY 1990.

IBRD AND IDA LENDING PROGRAM

The IBRD approved $16.4 billion in loans for FY 1989 (up 10 percent from FY 1988) to support 119 projects in 38 countries. IDA credits amounted to $4.9 billion (up 9 percent from FY 1988) or 106 projects in 42 countries.

Countries with an annual per capita income of $920 or less qualify for IDA credits. Because of resource constraints, however, virtually all IDA lending is directed to countries with annual per capita income below $580. Under the terms of the capital replenishment that furnished resources for FY 1989 (IDA VIII), approximately half of all IDA lending was earmarked for the nations of sub-Saharan Africa.

Total IBRD and IDA commitments in FY 1989 has the following sectoral composition:

Sector	U.S. Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total
Agriculture and Rural Development	3,490.0	16.3
Development Finance Companies	2,366.7	11.2
Education	890.7	4.3
Oil, Coal and Gas	580.7	2.8
Power	3,282.9	15.5
Industry	1,982.5	9.4
Nonproject	3,418.5	16.1
Population, Health and Nutrition	623.0	2.9
Small-Scale Enterprise	585.0	2.7
Technical Assistance	175.3	0.8
Telecommunications	161.0	0.1
Transportation	1,830.8	8.6
Urban Development	1,188.5	5.6
Water Supply and Sewerage	791.2	3.7
TOTAL	21,366.8	100.0

Projects approved by the IBRD and ODA during FY 1989 had the following regional distribution:

Region	Projects	U.S. Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total
Sub-Saharan Africa	81	3,924.7	18.4
Asia	62	7,832.5	36.7
Europe, Middle East and North Africa	39	3,767.5	17.6
Latin America and the Caribbean	43	5,842.1	27.3
TOTAL	225	21,366.8	100.0

MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY

MIGA, established in 1988 with U.S. support, has a specialized mandate: to encourage equity investment and other direct investment flows to developing countries through the mitigation of noncommercial investment barriers. To carry out this mandate, MIGA offers investors guarantees against noncommercial risks; advises developing member governments on the design and implementation of policies, programs and procedures related to foreign investments; and sponsors a dialogue between the international business community and host governments on investment issues. MIGA commenced operations in the latter half of 1989.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The IFC assists the economic development of its borrowing members countries by making loans to, and equity investments in, productive enterprises in the private sector; matching investment opportunities with domestic and foreign private capital and experienced management; helping to develop local and regional capital markets; and promoting privately owned development finance corporations. Projects are selected on the basis of financial viability and their contribution to economic development.

The IFC approved $1.7 billion for 90 projects in 37 countries during FY 1989, a 31 percent increase in lending from the previous year. The number of companies in which IFC holds investments rose from 454 to 468 by end of FY 1989.

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Following the trend in recent years, only developing countries borrowed from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in 1989. Drawings on Fund resources totaled Special Drawing Rights (SDR)* 3.5 billion, compared to SDR 2.7 billion in 1988, reversing several years of declining use of Fund resources.

At the end of 1989, aggregate general Fund credit outstanding amounted to SDR 22.3 billion, compared to SDR 24.8 billion at the end of 1988. This decline continues a trend since 1985 when general credit outstanding peaked at SDR 35.2 billion. Explanations include improved economic performance in some developing countries, less demand for IMF programs, and net repayments—consistent with the IMF's monetary character—on IMF loans extended during the 1982–1984 world recession and the onset of the debt crisis.

Under the strengthened international debt strategy endorsed in 1989, the IMF renewed its efforts to help debtor countries pursue sound market-oriented policies and agreed to provide resources to those implementing debt and debt service reduction operations negotiated with commercial bank creditors. Macroeconomic and structural reforms, as well as measures to encourage new foreign investment and repatriation of flight capital, are key components of the strategy. Several major debtor countries, including Mexico, the Philippines and Costa Rica, negotiated medium-term commercial bank financing packages, including debt and debt service reduction, in 1989.

---

* The SDR, the IMF's unit of account, is a composite of the currencies of the five members with the largest exports of goods and services during the 1980–1984 period: the U.S. dollar, West German mark, French franc, Japanese yen and U.K. pound sterling. The relative weights of the currencies broadly reflect their relative importance in international trade and finance. The SDR was valued at $1.31 on December 31, 1989; its average value in 1989 was $1.28.

IMF Stand-By Arrangements (SBA) and Extended Fund Facility (EFF) programs aim at balance of payments viability in the short and medium term, respectively. EFFs are especially designed to tackle structural distortions in the economy. In 1989 the IMF approved 12 new SBAs amounting to SDR 2.47 billion and 3 EFFs totaling SDR 7.16 billion, compared to 15 SBAs (SDR 2.7 billion) and 1 EFF (SDR 203 million) in 1988. In 1989 the IMF disbursed SDR 1.5 billion under Stand-By/Credit tranche transactions, compared to SDR 1.7 billion in 1988. EFF disbursements totaled SDR 1.2 billion, compared to SDR 200 million in 1988. At the end of 1989, there were 18 Stand-By and 4 Extended Arrangements, compared to 16 Stand-By and 2 Extended Arrangements in late 1988.

Several years ago, the IMF recognized that its shorter term resources based on market-oriented interest rates were not well suited to address protracted balance of payments and structural economic problems often underlying low-income countries' balance of payments difficulties. In 1986 the IMF created the Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF) to provide assistance to low-income countries on concessional terms. Financed by repayment of IMF Trust Fund loans extended in the 1970's, SAF loans support 3-year reform efforts in tandem with World Bank programs; for these loans, members develop a policy framework jointly with the IMF and the World Bank. The longer duration of the programs and the repayment of principal at concessional interest rates over 10 years, including a 5-year grace period, are designed to provide borrowers the breathing space they need in order to undertake structural reforms that promote sustainable growth.

At the 1987 Venice Summit, participants supported the IMF's call for a major increase in SAF resources; and the Enhanced SAF (ESAF) was created that year. Surplus member countries' loans to the IMF totaling SDR 6 billion, combined with some members' grant contributions, enable the Fund to provide ESAF resources at concessional rates to the poorest countries, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa. In 1989 the U.S. Administration obtained Congressional support for a FY 1990 $140 million ESAF contribution.

In 1989 the IMF approved three new SAF programs with total commitments of SDR 45.2 million, compared to seven programs totaling SDR 692.2 million in 1988. In 1989 SAF disbursements totaled SDR 700 million under 23 SAF programs, compared to SDR 300 million in 1988. In 1989 the IMF approved five ESAF programs with total commitments of SDR 594.5 million, compared to six programs totaling SDR 776 million in 1988. In 1989 ESAF drawings totaled SDR 300 million, compared to SDR 100 million in 1988. At the end of 1989, there were 18 Structural Adjustment and 11 Enhanced Structural Adjustment Arrangements, compared to 23 and 6, respectively.

In 1989 drawings under the Compensatory and Contingency Financing Facility (CCFF), established in 1988, amounted to SDR 800 million, compared to SDR 700 million in 1988. The CCFF preserves the essential features of the Compensatory Financing Facility, which was available to members facing payments difficulties stemming from temporary shortfalls in export earnings or surges in food import costs that were largely beyond the member's control. Through the contingency element of the CCFF, the Fund provides resources to members that face adverse external developments that threaten their programs.

Arrears to the IMF continued to grow rapidly, totaling SDR 3.1 billion in late 1989, compared to SDR 2.6 billion in late 1988. Further, 90 percent of the arrears was overdue for 6 months or longer; almost 55 percent of arrears was for 2 years or more. Arrears challenge the Fund's status as preferred creditor, weaken the IMF's financial position, erode the monetary character of the Fund, and potentially undermine the IMF's central role in the international financial system. The United States, in particular, has encouraged the Fund to review its policies toward members in arrears and to strengthen preventive, collaborative and remedial measures.

In 1989 the IMF continued its Ninth Quota Review, begun in 1988, to assess the adequacy of Fund resources and members' quotas in the context of the envisioned role of the Fund in the 1990's. Size and distribution of a quota increase, including reordering of ranking among the industrialized countries, as well as progress on resolving the problem of arrears to the Fund, were the key issues under consideration. In December the IMF extended the deadline for the review from December 1989 to March 1990. (In March 1990 the IMF extended the deadline to June 1990.)

In 1989 Angola joined the International Monetary Fund, increasing membership to 152 countries. With the exception of the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries, most developed and developing countries are members of the Fund.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was founded in 1977 with strong leadership from the United States. IFAD's mandate is to increase food production in the developing countries through loans for projects benefiting small farmers and landless poor. IFAD has traditionally been financed by a negotiated ratio of contributions from members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), as well as by smaller amounts from some of the more prosperous developing countries. IFAD has a unique governing structure that accords equal numbers of votes to the three groups of members—OECD (Category I), OPEC (Category II) and non-OPEC developing countries (Category III). Decisions have normally been made by consensus.

The president of IFAD is Idriss Jazairy from Algeria. The vice president is a former U.S. development official, Don Brown. Two other senior officers, Chief of Administrative Services and Director of IFAD Policy Review Division, are U.S. citizens. Of the 83 current professional employees, 8 are Americans.

The Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID) is the U.S. Governor on the IFAD Governing Council. The Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs in the Department of State is the U.S. Alternate Governor. The United States is the only country which occupies a permanent seat on IFAD's Executive Board, the body which approves projects and determines policy. All other countries take turns as members of the 36-member Board.

IFAD co-finances more than two-thirds of its portfolio with other multilateral institutions. The United States and other donors have encouraged co-financing in order to increase the engagement of other international financial institutions in small farmer development activities. Many of IFAD's loans (33 percent) fund projects designed by other international lending institutions, chiefly the World Bank and the regional development banks, with input from IFAD specifically on the small farmer and landless laborer aspects.

During 1978–1989, two-thirds of IFAD's resources were provided on highly concessional terms—1 percent interest, with 50-year repayment and 10-year grace periods. (These terms are available to countries with a per capita GNP of $300 in 1976 prices.) Other countries (23 percent) have received loans on intermediate terms of 4 percent interest, 5-year grace period and 20-year repayment. A few loans (8 percent) have been made on ordinary terms—8 percent interest, 3-year grace period and repayment in 15 to 18 years.

During the 11th session of the Governing Council, held January 23–26, 1989, in Rome, President Jazairy was elected to a second 4-year term. The plenary also approved the request of Greece to move from Category III to Category I. In the general debate, IFAD was praised for its innovative programs, lean overhead and attention to the environment and sustainable development. The remainder of the session was spent working toward an agreement on the third replenishment.

Basic agreement on a third replenishment for IFAD was reached at a reconvened IFAD Governing Council in June and finalized in October. The $566.3 million replenishment agreed upon will support a lending program of

$250-$350 million a year, well above the average of the 1984–1988 period. Since the OPEC countries did not provide a contribution level which other donors thought adequate for a 3-year replenishment, it was agreeed to shorten the third replenishment period to 2 years, with formal notification of participation due June 30, 1990, and final contributions due June 30, 1992.

The first element of the replenishment follows the traditional 60–40 OECD-OPEC burden sharing. However, the second element is based on the Category III members contributing significant amounts of convertable currencies for the first time, to be matched by the OECD countries on a three-to-one basis.

At its three meetings in 1989, the IFAD Executive Board approved 23 projects. A total of $277 million in new loans and technical assistance grants was approved for project activities in 1989. (Figures based on 1 SDR = $1.34, which is the average 1988 dollar rate for SDRs.) In FY 1989, the United States contributed $2.5 million to complete its obligation of $79,840,000 which it had pledged toward the second replenishment.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, one of the largest UN specialized agencies, is the lead international organization in the fields of agriculture, fisheries and forestry. FAO's agriculture program seeks to bring about a sustained global improvement in nutrition levels, food security and rural incomes, especially for the disadvantaged, through increasing rural productivity. Its fisheries program promotes improved management and utilization of the world's fishery resources, particularly by helping developing countries to increase their capacity to manage their marine and inland fisheries. The FAO forestry program assists member countries to find a balance between, on the one hand, environmental concerns and, on the other, both growing demands for forest goods and services and increasing pressures of agriculture on forest land. These FAO goals are consistent with the aims of U.S. bilateral development assistance programs.

FAO is governed by its Conference, to which all the member states of the Organization belong. The Conference is held biennially in odd-numbered years to review FAO's performance and to adopt the program of work and budget for the coming 2 years. Between Conference sessions, the 49-member FAO Council directs the work of the Organization. In even-numbered years, there are regional conferences in each of FAO's five geographic regions and a fall session of the Council. FAO is unusual among specialized agencies in that the Soviet Union is not a member. Having been a member of the 1944 Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which was instrumental in the founding of FAO, the Soviet Union would need only to declare its desire to be a member of FAO, and it would become one without the necessity of a vote on its admission. The Soviet Union, however, has not yet opted to join.

FAO COUNCIL

The 95th session of the FAO Council took place in Rome, June 19–30. The United States achieved all major objectives set for the 95th FAO Council with the exception of obtaining Council endorsement for official circulation to all FAO members of the experts' reports on the review of FAO. However, progress was made on that subject. It was anticipated that the reports would be officially circulated before the November Council/Conference. Program priorities advocated by the United States were supported by the Council and were to be incorporated into the full program of work and budget for 1990–1991. The Council maintained consensus on the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure which it recommended for adoption by the Conference and incorporation into the Code of Conduct on Distribution and Use of Pesticides. The Council supported having FAO hold an expert consultation in September on animal genetic resources.

Support for U.S.-sponsored budgetary reform procedures was stronger than expected, but the Council decided the Conference must take the final decision on budgetary reform. A proposed budget with one percent real growth was generally endorsed by the Council although five countries, including the United States, expressed support for zero real growth and several countries reserved their positions. A late addition to the agenda introduced the question of the possible membership of the European Community in FAO. After lengthy debate, the Council instructed the Director General to study all aspects of such a membership and report on it to the 98th Council in November 1990. The general atmosphere of the Council was constructive and noncontentious.

The 96th session of the Council took place in Rome, November 6–10 and was a forerunner to the Conference. A 1990–1991 biennial budget containing 1.1 percent real growth was proposed. The Group of 77 supported the Director General's call for additional funds for the technical cooperation program. Most of the OECD members, who are major donors, including the United States, United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, Canada, Australia and Japan insisted on zero real growth.

The 97th session of the Council was held in Rome on November 30, the day following the FAO Conference. The session elected members of the Program and Finance Committees, the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) and five members of the World Food Program's Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA). The United States was elected to the Finance Committee and the CCLM.

FAO CONFERENCE

The 25th session of the Conference was held in Rome, November 11–29. The U.S. Delegation was led by Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter.

In his address, Secretary Yeutter complimented the organization on its work in helping improve nutrition worldwide and challenged it to play an increasingly important role in the future. He noted the valuable contributions FAO makes in the areas of the food sanitary standards, global early warning, pest and disease control, and statistical work in agriculture, fisheries and forestry, among others. He urged FAO to give greater attention to promoting the role of the market system and private enterprise in agricultural development. He also called for FAO to adopt a policy of zero real growth and to concentrate on setting priorities. He underscored the importance of an effective, ongoing review process.

Two major issues in the plenary were reform and the budget. A budget with 4 percent real program growth and 16 percent cost increases was approved. Seven states, including the United States, which were assessed nearly 50 percent of the contributions, voted against the budget; five abstained. The United States emphasized that in an era of budgetary restraint, zero real growth had obtained acceptance in major UN system organizations.

In response to the 2-year studies by experts and by the technical committees of FAO, the Conference passed by consensus a package of program and operational reform measures which contained specific recommended changes if FAO is to accomplish its objectives. In the negotiations leading up to the decision, it was clear that donor and recipient nations were drawing closer in their understanding of how FAO should function.

The Conference rejected by a small margin the North American candidate for independent chairman, a candidate from the United States, thus violating the principle of rotation of posts among member nations. Also, the Conference strayed from FAO's generally apolitical tradition by pushing through, over intense U.S. objections, an unbalanced Palestinian aid resolution. The Conference rejected a draft which called for technical assistance to the Palestine people in favor of one which instructs FAO to provide assistance "in cooperation with the PLO."

The Conference also adopted a resolution on an Agreed Interpretation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources and a complementary resolution on Farmers' Rights. The resolutions preserved the principle of unrestricted availability of germplasm and recognized the rights of both donors of technologies and donors of germplasm to be compensated. The Conference adopted a resolution calling for FAO to intensify integration of environmental considerations in its activities, emphasizing especially the prevention of environmental degradation.

OTHER MEETINGS

The 10th session of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) held its biennial meeting April 26–May 5. Meetings of the COAG primarily focus on technical agricultural issues. They provide opportunities to review and examine a wide range of FAO technical program activities, as well as the FAO Summary Program of Work and Budget (SPWB).

In commenting on the SPWB, the U.S. Delegation stressed the importance of evaluation in future reviews and complimented the Secretariat on its priority setting in light of fiscal constraints. The Committee expressed unanimous support for greater FAO involvement in animal genetic issues. There was agreement that global animal genetic resource preservation had lagged behind what is being done on the plant side. The Committee decided to call an experts consultation to discuss the preservation of animal genetic resources. Agreement was reached on a prior informed consent (PIC) amendment to the FAO pesticide code.

THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

Since its establishment in 1963, the World Food Program (WFP) has been the principal vehicle within the UN system for distributing food aid. The FAO and the United Nations jointly sponsor WFP. WFP distributes food commodities: (1) to support development projects (e.g., food-for-work projects) designed to produce social and economic progress; and (2) as emergency food assistance responding to natural and man-made disasters. Development projects make up approximately 75 percent of the total WFP program and emergency projects the remaining 25 percent. WFP's long-term goal is to help developing countries become capable of producing or purchasing their national food requirements.

One aspect of social and economic progress is human resources development, which involves construction of schools, libraries, hospitals, etc., and improving nutrition through feeding school children and especially vulnerable groups like pregnant and nursing mothers. The most common implementation mechanism for WFP projects is "food-for-work." Food-for-work projects mobilize the unemployed for such tasks as clearing land, planting forests, building roads and the other types of construction just mentioned. In general, the laborers are paid, at least in part, with food commodities. The majority of WFP projects involve and therefore stimulate small-scale private sector participation in support of the development process.

WFP uses food aid to assist people adversely affected by structural adjustment programs. For example, WFP has targeted feeding programs to reach population groups whose real income has declined because of adjustment policies. As food subsidies decline, so does the real purchasing power of the poor. In these instances, WFP has sought those most in need of assistance as targets for food aid.

Within the UN system, the resources delivered by WFP are exceeded in value only by those provided by the World Bank. For calendar year 1989, (based on current estimates), WFP committed a total of $576 million to development projects, and resources valued at $94 million to emergency operations.

For the 1989–1990 biennium pledging period, WFP set an overall target of $1.4 billion, to include the value of commodities plus cash. As of December 31, 1989, pledges of $1,014 million had been received.

During fiscal year 1989, the United States contributed 471,000 metric tons of commodities worth $105 million and $50 million in transportation costs to the WFP regular program. The United States also contributed 26,550 metric tons of commodities worth $8.8 million and $5.8 million in transportation costs to the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR) for WFP emergency feeding programs. The United States contributed $964,000 to WFP for administrative expenses. WFP is the prime vehicle for U.S. multilateral food assistance efforts; WFP programs both complement and supplement U.S. bilateral efforts.

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA) is the governing body of WFP. The CFA is composed of 30 members, elected for 3-year terms, with 10 members elected annually. ECOSOC elects half of the members, and the FAO Council elects the remaining half. The United States and some other major donors are regularly reelected to the CFA. At the November 1989 meeting of the FAO Council, the United States was reelected to the CFA for a 3-year term beginning January 1, 1990.

The CFA meets twice a year to review WFP projects and resource commitments and to discuss WFP program and budgetary issues. WFP operates on a 2-year cycle for budgeting, programming and planning purposes. Donors pledge resources to WFP on a biennial basis. In 1987, for the 13th biennium (1989–1990), WFP established a pledge target of $405 million in cash and 3.25 million tons of food, making the total cash value of the pledge target $1.4 billion. Members contribute in cash, commodities or both. The United States has pledged $300 million in cash and commodities toward the WFP 1989–1990 biennium regular and emergency programs.

The second session of the Subcommittee on Projects met in Rome, May 22–24. Members expressed satisfaction with the new method of work. The 27th session of the CFA met in Rome from May 30 to June 9. The CFA approved 17 new and expanded projects and 5 budget increases recommended to it by the SCP for a total worth of $319 million.

In his address, Executive Director James Ingram noted the increasing needs for food aid and the urgent need to include a greater cash component in donations. He noted WFP plans to develop more projects that protect the environment, make more food purchases in less developed countries, and place more emphasis on women's role in development. The CFA approved the target goal for the 1991–1992 pledging biennium at $1.5 billion.

During this meeting, new procedures were approved for feeding programs for refugees and displaced persons in protracted situations. Resources for such groups, who have been in feeding programs longer than a year, will be handled as a subset of the WFP regular program, and no longer under the IEFR.

The third session of the WFP Subcommittee on Projects met in Rome, December 4–8 followed by the 28th session of the CFA December 11–13. During the meetings, 14 regular development projects with a value of $226 million as well as 10 projects for protracted refugee and displaced person operations with a value of $124 million were recommended by the SCP and approved by the CFA. The total number of refugees being assisted by WFP was estimated at 2,634,000; of displaced persons, 830,000.

The CFA agreed to follow the suggestion of the United Nations and request the Secretary General of the United Nations and Director General of the FAO to appoint an "eminent person" to examine the overall relationship between WFP and its sponsoring organizations, the United Nations and Food and Agriculture Organization. The CFA also urged the United Nations and FAO to intensify negotiations to complete a headquarters agreement for WFP with the Italian Government.

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

As a founding member of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United States is committed to the principles embodied in the UNESCO constitution. Today, as in UNESCO's early years, the United States believes that international cooperation in education, science, culture and communications can be a positive element in building a peaceful world.

The United States maintained its observer status with UNESCO during 1989. The U.S. Observer Mission to UNESCO, located in Paris, promoted residual U.S. interests at UNESCO and worked with Secretariat officials and representatives of other countries to encourage reform within the Organization. During 1989, the United States sent observer delegations to the 131st, 132nd and 133rd sessions of UNESCO's Executive Board and to the 25th session of UNESCO's General Conference, which met October 17–November 16.

The United States continued an open dialogue with UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor during the second year of his term. Acting Secretary of State Michael Armacost and Acting Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs Penny Eastman met with Mayor during his courtesy call at the Department of State in February. Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs John R. Bolton met with him on several occasions in Paris.

Director General Mayor presented his first major policy document, the third medium-term plan, to the 131st session of the Executive Board, which proposed a number of changes. The 25th General Conference adopted a revised text by consensus.

Congressional interest in UNESCO led to two hearings on UNESCO during 1989. Senator Moynihan convened a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 19 and heard testimony from private sector experts on UNESCO. Congressman Dymally held hearings before the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Specialists in UNESCO's fields of competence testified, as did Assistant Secretary Bolton, on behalf of the Department of State.

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) submitted to the 131st session of the Executive Board in May an application for membership in UNESCO on behalf of the self-declared "State of Palestine." The United States opposed the move on the grounds that "Palestine" does not qualify as a state under generally accepted criteria of international law. The U.S. Representatives emphasized that admission of the "State of Palestine" to UNESCO membership or enhancement of the PLO's status beyond that of an observer delegation would preclude any consideration of U.S. reentry into UNESCO. The 25th General Conference deferred consideration of the application until the 26th session of the General Conference in 1991.

The Independent Commission on Management and Personnel Practices, appointed by Director General Mayor in December 1988 and chaired by Knut Hammarskjold, issued its report on December 20. The Commission was established "to advise the Director General on ways and means of improving staff efficiency and management in the UNESCO Secretariat." The Director General also appointed an International Panel of Advisors for guidance on implementation of the report.

During 1989 the United States remained a party to the following UNESCO-related Agreements and Conventions:

— The Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural character, with Protocol (Beirut Agreement), done at Lake Success, July 15, 1949;

— The Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, with Protocol, (Florence Agreement), done at Lake Success, November 22, 1950;

— The Universal Copyright Convention and Protocols 1, 2 and 3 Annexed thereto, done at Geneva, September 6, 1952;

— The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, adopted at Paris, December 3, 1958;

— The Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its 16th session on November 14, 1979;

— The Universal Copyright Convention as revised at Paris on July 14, 1971, and Protocols 1 and 2 Annexed thereto, adopted on July 14, 1971, by an International Conference of States convened by UNESCO;

— The Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms done at Geneva, October 29, 1971; and

— The Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage done at Paris, November 16, 1972.

The United States also participated in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP). The regulations governing these UNESCO-related bodies allow participation by non-UNESCO member states.

The United States made voluntary contributions, through the International Convention and Scientific Organization Contributions (ICSOC) Account, of approximately $2 million to selected international scientific or cultural activities in UNESCO's fields of competence considered important to U.S. interests. In the past, financing for these purposes was provided through U.S. annual contributions to UNESCO. Among other bodies or activities funded were the Man and the Biosphere Program and international activities in library and information science. A separate contribution of approximately $220,000 was made to the World Heritage Fund, whose Secretariat is provided by UNESCO.

UNESCO CONVENTION ON THE MEANS OF PROHIBITING AND PREVENTING THE ILLICIT IMPORT, EXPORT AND TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

During 1989 the United States carried out its obligations under the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property in a number of ways. On March 14 the United States imposed emergency import restrictions on antique Amyara textiles belonging to the community of Coroma, Bolivia. U.S. action, in response to a request from the Government of Bolivia, was the second action taken by the United States under the Convention. In 1987 the United States imposed emergency import restrictions on certain pre-Columbian artifacts from El Salvador.

During the year, the Governments of Peru and Guatemala officially asked the United States to impose emergency import restrictions on certain of their archaeological materials in order to curb rampant looting and illegal flow of pre-Columbian artifacts. U.S. action is being considered in response to these requests. Also, a U.S. Delegation actively participated in a symposium on illicit trafficking in art and cultural property organized by INTERPOL and UNESCO held in Lyon, France, in December.

Although there are 68 state parties to the Convention, the United States remains the only state party that is considered a major importer of art. U.S. actions under the Convention are authorized by the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, 19 U.S.C. 2601 et seq., as amended. Most of the Presidential functions in the Act are carried out by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, who acts in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Treasury and upon the recommendation of the President's Cultural Property Advisory Committee. The Secretary of State is responsible for negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements under the Act. Enforcement is the responsibility of the U.S. Commissioner of Customs.

UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

The international copyright activities of UNESCO, conducted primarily in association with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), addressed a variety of issues of importance to American copyright interests during 1989.

In late June to early July 1989, the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention met in Paris. Among the many items on its agenda, the Committee discussed the practical application of the Universal Copyright Convention, the legal and technical assistance to states, the protection of translators and the report of the World Congress on Education and Information in the Field of Copyright.

At the same time, late June to early July 1989, the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention, sitting with the Executive Committee of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, met to review the substantive copyright issues and activities undertaken since the last meeting of the two committees which was held in June 1987.

In July 1989 UNESCO and WIPO convened a committee of governmental experts at WIPO headquarters in Geneva to consider the status of the international protection of neighboring rights under the Rome Convention.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) is the only intergovernmental body for promoting cooperative ocean science on a global scale. The Commission is unique within the UNESCO organization in that it is functionally autonomous, with its own membership of 117 countries, and its own program and budget supported not only by UNESCO but also by its member states.

Under the leadership of its respected new Secretary, Dr. Gunnar Kullenberg, the IOC is more important than ever in furthering U.S. objectives in global ocean science, particularly programs that can contribute to the international dimension of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (GCRP).

According to an Executive Office press release of January 29, 1990:

> The President's budget for FY 1991 proposes spending $1.57 billion for global change research by Federal agencies, an increase of 57 percent over FY 1990. According to Presidential Science Adviser, D. Allan Bromley, . . . "With this budget, the President challenges the United States and the international scientific community to address significant scientific uncertainties and develop more reliable scientific predictions of future conditions. The development of sound . . . policies and timely responses depends on this research."

The following components of the U.S. Global Research Program will benefit by our participation in the IOC:

— Studies of the dynamics and circulation of the world's oceans and their role in global change;

— Investigations of the human-induced and natural processes within the ocean that control the concentrations of greenhouse gases;

— Education and training programs for the development of the scientific talent necessary to conduct multidisciplinary global change research.

The IOC Executive Council met in July 1989. A major action taken by the Council was its decision to initiate the planning and implementation of a global ocean observing system. Such a system is critical to the success of the GCR, and will be built around existing components in cooperation with the World Meteorological Organization and the UN Environment Program. Although implementation of the operational system will require a major commitment of resources by member states, it is so important to future research that widespread support is likely. The plan should be ready for discussion and adoption at the 1992 second UN Conference on Environment and Development.

Other IOC activities from which the United States derives significant benefits include:

— The IOC International Coordination Group for the Tsunami Warning System in the Pacific, which meets each year, oversees a program which benefits U.S. coastal economic interests directly by monitoring undersea earthquakes and issuing timely warnings of resulting tsunamis (so-called "tidal waves"). At its

1989 meeting, significant advances were made in improving efficient transmission of data.

— Ongoing U.S participation in the IOC Technical Committee for International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchanges, and the ICSU/IOC World Data Center System for Oceanography, provides U.S. agencies and scientists with access to foreign-source data at cost savings valued at over $1 million per average year. It also provides a mechanism for agreement among data agencies on international data standards and formats, which permit data to be exchanged at less cost. These programs are proposed to be expanded for applications to global change data management.

— The IOC/WMO Technical Committee for the Global Ocean Services System, at its 1989 meeting, took action to improve the Voluntary Observing Ship system, and to upgrade transmission of real-time data on the Global Telecommunications System (GTS). This program provides operational data in real-time for weather forecasting and ship routing, as well as data products for use in global change monitoring and modeling.

— The IOC Marine Pollution Research and Monitoring Program is now being implemented, in cooperation with UNEP and ICES, to provide a global assessment of oceanic contaminants and biological effects of pollution, and is expected to provide a scientific basis for regulatory actions under international conventions—e.g., the London Dumping Convention.

— The IOC Subcommissions for the Western Pacific and for the Caribbean both met in 1989. They initiated several important regional programs addressing ocean circulation, harmful algal blooms and studies of the life cycle of shrimp.

INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CORRELATION PROGRAM

The principal goal of the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP) is to promote cooperative research on global geologic problems. In recent years, the program has expanded from its traditional themes of correlation and calibration by giving increased emphasis to such topics as (1) the early evolution of the earth's crust and the sequence and global extent of subsequent geologic events, and (2) the present-day geologic environment, including geologic hazards and global climate change. The program work is carried out through 51 individual research projects that last from 4 to 10 years, depending on the complexity of the scientific problem to be studied.

The United States has played a prominent role in IGCP since its establishment in 1973. U.S. geoscientists helped design the program and are members of the IGCP Board and Advisory Scientific Committee. Funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) has been critical to the success of the program. NSF funds serve as a catalyst to stimulate additional support from universities, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and private industry. These funds support domestic meetings of U.S. project working groups, travel by U.S. representatives to project conferences and field excursions abroad, and general clerical and technical assistance to working group chairman. As a result, 19 U.S. working groups, each consisting of 3 or more scientists, are participating in the program.

IGCP project activities in the United States are guided and coordinated by the U.S. National Committee for IGCP (USNC/IGCP), organized in 1974 as a subcommittee of the U.S. National Committee on Geology. The USNC/IGCP, chaired by Bruce D. Marsh (Johns Hopkins University), screens proposals from U.S. scientists for new projects before their submission to the IGCP Board.

MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE PROGRAM

During 1989 U.S. scientists, as individuals and as members of the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program (U.S. MAB), continued to collaborate with the UNESCO MAB Program and with other programs and agencies of the United Nations.

Funds which the Department of State contributed through the voluntary contributions section of the Foreign Assistance Act, and through the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, were granted to U.S. MAB to provide support for specific international projects of U.S. scientists which would normally have been funded by UNESCO. Several of these projects were also carried out in conjunction with scientists supported directly by UNESCO and other UN bodies.

Using such funds, U.S. MAB scientists organized a workshop in the Caribbean on land-based sources of marine pollution. The UN Environment Program also contributed funds to support this workshop which resulted in specific preparations and a call for an international protocol to establish marine effluent controls and water quality standards in the wider Caribbean region.

U.S. MAB scientists also collaborated in the production of a new UNESCO book series on international environmental issues published in collaboration with the Parthenon Press. Nine of the first 12 volumes which are currently in process were written by U.S. MAB scientists on topics ranging from tropical forests to urban pollution and fresh-water lake eutrophication. In addition, the Chair of the U.S. MAB directorate on Temperate Ecosystems collaborated with scientists in the UNESCO MAB Secretariat during 1989, and they produced a manuscript for the special issues series of the *UNESCO MAB Digest* on the "Role of Land/Inland Water Ecotones in Landscape Management and Restoration: a Proposal for Collaborative Research."

Two scientists from the U.S. MAB program received invitations and funding from UNESCO to participate in an international conference held in Paris on future research strategies for tropical forests.

UNESCO MAB provided funds to support an international conference in San Francisco on the application of the biosphere reserve concept to marine areas. Federal agencies which support U.S. MAB also provided direct supportive funding for this conference. UNESCO and U.S. MAB collaborated to provide funds for participants at a series of MAB workshops at the annual summer meetings of the American Institute of Biological Sciences in Toronto, Canada.

UNESCO and U.S. MAB provided funds to support the MAB Biological Diversity Program headquartered at the Smithsonian Institution. A collaborative research project of a U.S. scientist to preserve tropical forests in Madagascar received joint funding from UNESCO MAB and the U.S. MAB Program.

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The United States initiated the development of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and was the first nation to ratify it in December 1973.

In October 1987 the United States was elected, by more votes than any other country, to a 6-year term on the World Heritage Committee, the 21-member governing body of the Convention. The Convention has over 100 signatories and is the largest international body working to protect mankind's natural and cultural heritage.

The World Heritage List is a compendium of natural areas and cultural sites, now 323 in number, considered to have universal significance for all mankind. Seventeen U.S. sites, including the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone National Park and the Statue of Liberty are on the World Heritage List.

The United States made a voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund of $220,000 in both 1988 and 1989. The Convention and its Fund, which assist needy countries, have enabled many nations to preserve their unique natural and cultural legacies. Measures taken by member countries to protect natural sites often contribute to the preservation of endangered species and biological diversity.

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO has been inactive since December 1985 when the membership of all its Commissioners expired.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was established by a convention signed at Stockholm in 1967, which entered into force on April 26,

1970. The United States is a party to the convention, which has 126 member states. WIPO is the principal worldwide organization responsible for promoting the protection of intellectual property, which comprises two elements: copyrights (mainly literary and artistic works) and industrial property (mainly patents on inventions, trademarks and industrial designs). WIPO is also responsible for the administration of some 15 intergovernmental "Unions," each founded on a multilateral treaty. The two principal treaties are the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which has 100 parties, and the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, to which 84 nations have adhered. The United States has been a party to the former convention since 1887. On March 1, 1989, the United States adhered to the Berne Convention.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Paris and Berne Conventions earlier had provided for an international bureau to serve as Secretariat for each of the respective unions of the member states of these agreements. These were united in 1893 under the name of the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property (BIRPI). Although BIRPI still has a legal existence for states that are members of one of the Unions but not of WIPO, in practice it has been supplanted by the International Bureau established by the Stockholm Convention to be the Secretariat of WIPO. WIPO became a specialized agency of the United Nations in 1974.

The International Bureau operates under the direction of WIPO member states through a General Assembly and a conference which meet in ordinary session every second calendar year. The principal administrative organs of the Paris and Berne Unions are the assemblies of each union, consisting of all the member states. The Paris and Berne Unions elect executive committees from among their member states, and the joint membership of these two committees constitutes WIPO's Coordination Committee. It meets annually and is entrusted with the normal tasks of such a governing body, especially the implementation of WIPO's biennial program and budget. As a member of the Paris Union Executive Committee, the United States continued as a member of the WIPO Coordination Committee through 1989.

During the year, the United States was also a member of the WIPO General Assembly and the following committees: the Budget Committee, the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights, the Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information, and the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

One of two basic objectives of WIPO is to promote the protection of intellectual property on a worldwide basis. In support of this objective, WIPO encourages the conclusion of new international treaties and the harmonization of national laws; it gives legal-technical assistance to developing countries; it assembles and disseminates information on intellectual property; it maintains international registration services in the fields of trademarks, industrial designs, and appellations of origin; and it performs the administrative tasks for an international patent filing arrangement.

The second basic objective of WIPO is to ensure administrative cooperation among the unions. Centralizing the administration of the various unions in the International Bureau helps ensure economy both for the member states and for the private sector concerned with intellectual property.

Member nations contribute to six of the WIPO unions, known as the "Program Unions." WIPO's 1990–1991 biennial gross assessed budget for the Program Unions is 49,976,000 Swiss Francs. It represents a slight increase over the 1986–1987 budget. The United States is assessed approximately 3.9 percent of total assessments.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

The Permanent Committee for Patent Information, established in 1977, was renamed the Permanent Committee for Industrial Property Information. It continues to coordinate all technical activities in regard to international patent classification and cooperation.

ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Activities of WIPO in the field of development cooperation with respect to developing countries continued in 1989 under the direction of two committees composed of developed and developing countries, the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights and the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property. The United States participates in both of these committees and supports most of their activities, which are numerous and varied.

During 1989 WIPO continued to provide traineeships to officials from developing countries in the fields of industrial property and copyright. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office participated by providing training to a number of developing country nationals in the industrial property field, as did the U.S. Copyright Office in the copyright field.

REVISION OF THE PARIS CONVENTION

The United States continued its active participation in the revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the most important multilateral treaty in this field. Four sessions of a diplomatic conference, held from 1980 to 1984, failed to resolve questions concerning a voting procedure for adoption of a revision (the United States prefers unanimous consent), issues relating to sanctions for not working a patent in a given country and trademark issues concerning the use of geographical names to identify products. The Assembly of the Paris Union decided that consultations aimed at improving the prospects for positive results should precede a fifth session of the diplomatic conference. Consultative meetings were held in June 1985, January, May and September 1987 and September 1988. No conclusions were reached regarding the convening of a fifth session of the diplomatic conference.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

A total of 41 countries have ratified or adhered to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). Under the PCT, U.S. citizens and residents may file an international patent application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Washington. The effect of the international application is the same as if national applications had been concurrently filed with national patent offices (including the European Patent Office) of those countries party to the PCT which the applicant designates. The international application is then subjected to a search of prior art by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and the applicant then decides, on the basis of the international search report, whether it is worthwhile to pursue applications in the various countries designated. National procedures in such countries are delayed until 20 months after the priority date, unless the applicant asks for an earlier start. National procedures may be delayed until 30 months after the priority date if the applicant requests an examination in addition to a search. Since July 1987, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has also undertaken an international preliminary examination if the applicant requests it.

BRUSSELS SATELLITE CONVENTION

On March 7, 1985, the United States became a party to the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Program-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite (Brussels Satellite Convention). This convention obliges each contracting state to take adequate and effective measures to prevent the unauthorized distribution on or from its territory of any program-carrying signal transmitted by a nondirect broadcast satellite. While only 12 countries are party to the convention, they include the predominant users of international satellite communications facilities. It is a most important agreement with respect to piracy of satellite television signals. The United States is encouraging other countries to join the Brussels Convention.

ADHERENCE TO BERNE CONVENTION

On March 1, 1989, the United States became a member of the Berne Convention. This convention is the oldest multilateral copyright agreement in existence and has the highest recognized standard of copyright protection of all the copyright treaties. By joining the Berne Convention, the United

States establishes copyright relations with an additional 25 countries. In addition to the basic right of national treatment, the Berne Convention provides for certain important authors' rights such as public performance of dramatic, dramatico-musical and musical works. Since the Convention entered into force in 1987, it has undergone five major revisions—the last being in 1971.

REGISTRATION OF AUDIOVISUAL WORKS

At a diplomatic conference held in Geneva at WIPO Headquarters, April 10–20, the "Treaty on the International Registration of Audiovisual Works" was adopted and signed on April 20. Eight governments, including the United States, signed the treaty on that date. As of December 31, 1989, when the treaty was closed for signature an additional nine governments had signed.

The purpose of the treaty is to facilitate enforcement of rights and increase the legal security in transactions relating to audiovisual works and to contribute to the fight against piracy. The treaty provides for the establishment of an international register for applications and related materials concerning the exercise of rights in audiovisual works such as motion pictures and television programs, including in particular rights relating to their exploitation. Public access to the elements entered into the international system will be facilitated by publication in a timely Gazette. A comprehensive database of rights owners will also be maintained from which WIPO will be able to provide information electronically to interested parties.

PROTECTION OF INTEGRATED CIRCUITS

Existing intellectual property arrangements have appeared inappropriate and insufficient in protecting the designs of semiconductor chip products. The United States and Japan, by far the world's leading producers of integrated circuits and semiconductor chip products (accounting for about 80 percent of the total), have enacted their own unique legislation to protect such designs, the United States in 1984 and Japan in 1985.

WIPO began work on a new treaty for the protection of semiconductor chips in 1985. Various versions of its draft treaty were considered by a Committee of Experts at four sessions, in November 1985, June 1986, April 1987 and November 1988. A series of consultations with experts also was held in February 1986 and January and May 1988. The developing nations, concerned about the ramifications of a treaty, had asked for a series of reports and meetings so that they could become better informed about the issues involved.

Despite G–77 efforts to slow proceedings, WIPO moved rapidly to conclude an agreement, and at the November 1988 experts meeting the developed nations indicated their belief that the time was ripe for a diplomatic conference.

WIPO convened a diplomatic conference in Washington May 8–26, and concluded the Treaty on the Protection of Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits (the Washington Treaty). The United States, joined only by Japan, voted against the text of the treaty. We believe the treaty does not provide an adequate and effective standard for the protection of integrated circuits. Six nations have signed the treaty which is not yet in force.

World Health Organization (WHO)

In 1989 the World Health Organization, based in Geneva, began a process of reorganization under Director General Hiroshi Nakajima (Japan), elected in 1988. New biennial budgets were adopted for WHO, for the Pan American Health Organization (which serves as WHO's regional office for the Americas), and for the International Agency for Research on Cancer—all three of them adhering to the principle of zero real growth. Significant expansion was noted for WHO's Global Program on AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome), which is funded almost entirely with extrabudgetary funds. The World Health Assembly, meeting in May, promoted new attention to AIDS as well as a number of other technical health programs. The Assembly also voted to defer action on a controversial application for membership in WHO submitted by the PLO.

U.S. PARTICIPATION

The U.S. Government continued its long-standing cooperation with WHO on substantive and technical matters. Many U.S. experts participated in the work of WHO technical meetings, and a large number of U.S. institutions continued their research work as WHO collaborating centers. U.S. experts played a major role in the development of WHO activities aimed at the eradication of polio by the year 2000 and the elimination of dracunculiasis (guinea worm disease) in the 1990s.

In addition, U.S. citizens continued to hold major positions on the WHO staff, including the posts of Assistant Director General for Administration, Assistant Director General for Communicable Diseases, Director for Budget and Finance, Acting Director of the Expanded Program on Immunization, Director of the Global Program on AIDS, Director of the Diarrheal Diseases and Acute Respiratory Infections Control Programs and Director of Program Development. As in the past, there were more WHO professional staff members from the United States than from any other nation.

The U.S. Delegation to the 42nd World Health Assembly, held in Geneva from May 8 to 19, was headed by Dr. Louis W. Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services. The delegation included Dr. James O. Mason, DHHS

Assistant Secretary for Health; John R. Bolton, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs; Dr. C. Everett Koop, U.S. Surgeon General; Joseph C. Petrone, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations office in Geneva; Neil A. Boyer, Director for Health and Transportation Programs in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Dr. Kenneth Bart, Director for Health, Agency for International Development; and Dr. Frank E. Young, Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

Secretary Sullivan, in his address to the Assembly, reviewed U.S. mechanisms to monitor health progress. He gave special attention to the *1990 Health Objectives for the Nation*, a report which set 226 measurable health care targets. He said one conclusion of a 10-year study was that success had been achieved in the United States not simply through resources of the government, but through the combined efforts of many organizations and individuals, within and outside the fields of health and medicine. In view of the pending controversy over the PLO application for membership, Secretary Sullivan also cautioned delegates to the Assembly against taking political steps that would not be in the best interests of WHO.

The United States sent a delegation to the major business meeting of the WHO Executive Board, held in Geneva from January 9 to 20. The U.S. Delegation to the meeting was headed by Dr. Craig Wallace, Associate Director of the National Institutes of Health for International Research, acting as alternate to Dr. Young, the U.S. member of the Board. The 3-year term of the United States on the Board expired in May 1989. The United States sent observer delegations to the 2-day meeting of the Board on May 22–23, and to the meeting of the Board's Program Committee, on June 26–30. The United States expected to be elected to a 3-year term on the Board at the Assembly in May 1990.

At the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), Assistant Secretary Mason headed the delegation to the 34th meeting of the Directing Council, in Washington, D. C., on September 25–29; the Council consists of senior offficals of all 38 PAHO member governments. U.S. Delegations also attended meetings of the 9-member PAHO Executive Committee, on June 26–30 and on September 30, as well as meetings of the PAHO Subcommittee on Planning and Programming, on April 10–13 and December 7–8.

Dr. Audrey Manley, DHHS Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health, headed the U.S. Delegation to the 40th meeting of the WHO regional committee for the Western Pacific, held in Manila, the Philippines, on September 19–25. The United States sent an observer delegation to the annual meeting of the regional committee for Europe, held in Paris, France, on September 12–16. A delegation was sent to the 30th meeting of the Governing Council of WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), held on May 4–5 in Lyon, France.

U.S. officials also participated in meetings of the governing bodies of a number of WHO technical programs that operate primarily with voluntarily contributed funds. These included the UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Program of Research and Training in Tropical Diseases, the Onchocerciasis (river blindness) Control Program, the Diarrheal Diseases and Acute Respiratory Infections Control Programs, the Essential Drugs Program and the Global Program on AIDS.

Dr. Koop was the recipient of the distinguished Leon Bernard Foundation Prize at the Assembly in May, for his outstanding achievements in the field of social medicine. The Assembly was told that Dr. Koop's contributions, especially in the areas of smoking, AIDS, and the conduct of the Surgeon General's technical workshops, had a significant effect on the prevention of illness and other threats to health.

HEALTH ISSUES

During 1989, the first full year for WHO under the leadership of Director General Nakajima, the organization continued efforts to address many pressing health issues. Dr. Nakajima described the process as "continuity with change," emphasizing the continued promotion of primary health care and preventive health measures, while making adjustments to reflect changing health needs on both global and national levels.

Throughout this first full year of his tenure, Dr. Nakajima instituted a number of organizational shifts which he said were designed to enhance WHO's efficiency and effectiveness. One of the shifts was to create a new Assistant Director General post to oversee communicable diseases. He appointed to that post an American, Dr. Ralph (Rafe) Henderson, who previously had headed WHO's Expanded Program on Immunization.

In September WHO issued a public "report on world health," addressing the extent of global disease. The report concluded that about one billion people, or more than 20 percent of the world's population, most of them in developing countries, were seriously ill or malnourished. WHO said much of the toll is caused by contagious diseases that can be prevented by vaccines or treated with drugs that are readily available in developing countries. Dr. Nakajima said that the missing ingredient was the will to help developing nations. He said that increasing annual health spending in those countries by an average of only $2 per person would provide enough money to immunize all children in those countries, eradicate polio worldwide, and buy the drugs needed to treat all cases of childhood diarrhea, tuberculosis, bacterial pneumonia, malaria, schistosomiasis and sexually transmitted diseases.

To help draw attention to the need for more resources for health, Dr. Nakajima appointed a goodwill ambassador for WHO. To undertake the task, he named Dr. Her Royal Highness Princess Professor Chulabhorn, youngest daughter of the king and queen of Thailand and director of the Chulabhorn Research Institute.

Primary Health Care

The Assembly in May gave unreserved support for WHO's continuing advocacy of primary health care. The Director General said he had accepted the Executive Board's recommendation that he create a global advisory body for primary health care. The Assembly adopted a resolution asking countries to undertake systematic assessments of their allocation of health resources, in light of continuing reports that available resources have been poorly deployed, and urging WHO to assist them in economic analyses that could lead to improved resource allocation.

AIDS

In the course of the year, WHO gave extended attention to AIDS, through many expert meetings and expanded activities in member countries designed to prevent and control the disease. Delegates to the Assembly praised the program for its global leadership, consensus building, development of political support, generation of resources, coordination of public policy issues and stimulation of collaboration among scientists. WHO described the program as going through a transition, which included an "orderly decentralization," which would see more of the program implemented through WHO regional offices rather than directly from headquarters in Geneva.

The Assembly adopted by consensus resolutions establishing December 1 of 1989 and future years as "World AIDS Day" and calling on member states to involve nongovernmental organizations in the development of their AIDS-control policies and strategies. A resolution of the UN General Assembly (44/233), adopted by consensus in December, similarly called for the greater involvement of nongovernmental organizations in efforts to educate the public about misconceptions regarding HIV infection and preventive actions that could be taken.

In the course of the year, WHO began to convene sessions of a new Global Management Committee. The Committee, composed primarily of the major donors to the program, met in April and again in December to review policies of the program and particularly the use of resources. Bradshaw Langmaid, Jr., Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology of U.S. AID was elected chairman of the group.

At the December meeting, the Committee gave extended attention to the possibility of withdrawal of international participation in the June 1990 San Francisco conference on AIDS because of U.S. visa policy relating to HIV-infected travelers. The committee urged avoidance of discrimination against people infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as people with AIDS, and urged unrestricted attendance of such people at international meetings.

In 1989 WHO received $88.8 million in voluntary contributions for conduct of its Global Program on AIDS. Of that amount, the U.S. Government (U.S. AID) contributed $25.5 million, or 28.7 percent. For 1990 WHO budgeted $109.4 million. The U.S Government planned to contribute $20.6 million from FY 1990 appropriations, or about 19 percent. In addition to the financial contributions, the U.S. Government continued to loan a number of individuals to WHO for varying periods of time to assist in operation of the AIDS-control program. These included the director of the program, Dr. Jonathan Mann, an officer of the DHHS Centers for Disease Control.

Malaria and the Control of Vectors

Assembly delegates expressed great concern about the resurgence of malaria, especially in Africa and especially in the very young. They said local epidemics were beginning to overwhelm primary health care systems and to hamper economic development. One resolution addressing this point asked the Director General to strengthen the WHO program and to reinforce malaria training programs. Another resolution expressed concern about vector-borne diseases in Latin American and Asia, taking special note of the importance of urbanization and population movements in the spread of these diseases.

Guinea Worm Disease

The Assembly adopted a resolution declaring that elimination of dracunculiasis, or guinea worm disease, as a public health problem was possible in the 1990s. The disease, manifested by worms two-to-three feet long, emerging from any part of the human body, occurs primarily in Africa and Asia. There is no treatment. However, the Assembly believed the disease could be eliminated through a combined strategy of safe water sources, surveillance, health education, vector control and personal prophylaxis. Member states were asked to give high priority to provision of safe drinking water.

Immunization

The Assembly reviewed plans for the coming decade and endorsed the plan for the eradication of poliomyelitis by the year 2000. Specific concern was expressed about current coverage of immunization against childhood diseases in Africa. The regional director said the situation was improving, but many problems remained and would have to be met through reallocation of the region's resources.

Purchase and Sale of Human Organs

The Assembly reiterated its concern about commercial traffic in human organs, saying it exploits human distress, especially in vulnerable groups. It unanimously adopted a resolution calling on member states to take appropriate steps, including legislation if necessary, to prohibit the trafficking.

Surgeon General Koop told the Assembly that the United States deplores the commercial use of organs for transplantation, especially if they are obtained unethically or immorally. He said U.S. law prohibits such activities. Having personally arranged clearing houses for organ transplants in the United States, Dr. Koop said categorically that those agencies are not involved in commercial trafficking and that such trafficking does not exist in the United States.

Tobacco

The Assembly adopted a resolution endorsing WHO's plan of action for the program entitled "Tobacco or Health" for 1988–1995. It asked WHO to support national authorities, at their request, in taking measures to disseminate information on the health risks of tobacco use and to control the promotion of tobacco consumption. It also asked WHO to work with FAO in developing crop substitution programs for countries whose economies are heavily dependent on tobacco production.

Assistant Secretary Mason, deputy U.S. Delegate, told the Assembly that the use of tobacco was one of the greatest single causes of preventable disease and death, and that the United States fully supported the WHO action program and was prepared to contribute to it.

Other Health Topics

The Assembly also adopted resolutions on cardiovascular diseases, diabetes mellitus, medical education, oral health, salmonellosis in poultry products, the health of youth, women's health, traditional medicine, nursing and midwifery personnel, drug and alcohol abuse and health promotion.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

Adoption of Program Budget for 1990–1991

The World Health Assembly in May adopted a new effective working budget for 1990–1991 totaling $653,740,000. The budget reflected nominal growth of 7.35 percent over the budget for 1988–1989, comprised of minus 0.37 percent real growth, minus 0.43 percent for currency fluctuation, and 8.15 percent in cost increases. The budget was calculated at 1.65 Swiss francs to the dollar, the same as the 1988–1989 budget. It was to be financed in part with $40,977,000 in casual income (from interest earnings, exchange rate gains and other miscellaneous income), $4,000,000 in support costs transferred from UNDP, and the balance from assessments on member states. The United

States, which is assessed 25 percent of the budget, was to pay $78,390,425 in each year of the biennial period.

The U.S. Delegation welcomed the continuation of the WHO policy of proposing budgets with zero real growth and maintaining a frugal approach to cost increases. The Soviet Delegation said it was pleased with the budget and was voting yes on a budget proposal for only the second time. The appropriation resolution was adopted by consensus.

Budget Reform

The U.S. Delegation pointed out that this was the first budget to be developed under the budget reform guidelines laid down by the Executive Board in January 1987. The delegation also continued to press for opportunities for the Assembly or some other governing body to review and make decisions on priorities within the budget. It pointed out that the 2-week discussion on the budget had included numerous calls by member states for increases in particular program activities, but no requests for compensating decreases. The delegation said this made it difficult to adjust priorities within a zero-real-growth approach to the budget.

In further implementation of the budget reform policies, the Executive Board's Program Committee, meeting in June, set the initial guidelines for development of the 1992–1993 budget, noting that the Director General had proposed zero real growth and percentage ceilings on cost increases.

Exchange Rate Fluctuation

The Assembly extended for 1990–1991 the authority for the Director General to draw from the casual income account up to $31 million in order to maintain program activity in the event of exchange rate losses during the biennium. Complaints about this exchange rate facility from Canada and France led to a strong rebuttal by Assistant Director General Warren Furth (U.S.), who said WHO's system of dealing with the uncertainties of exchange rate fluctuation was the envy of the entire UN system. The U.S. Delegation expressed concern that in the 1988–1989 biennium, when the exchange rate had fallen below the budgeted rate of 1.65 Swiss francs to the dollar, WHO had drawn $25 million from the exchange rate facility although the financial report showed that only $12 million had been needed. Furth said that if, at the end of the biennium, it was revealed that the funds had not been needed, they would be returned to the casual income account.

Real Estate Requirements

The Assembly authorized expenditure of 18.1 million Swiss francs (about $12.1 million) for construction of a new annex to the Geneva headquarters. The proposal said that costs would be covered entirely by rental charges against programs funded outside the regular budget, particularly the expanding Global Program on AIDS. The U.S. Delegation asked for, and received, assurances from Assistant Director General Furth that the projections of growth in the extrabudgetary programs and in rental income were adequate, and that there would be no charges against the regular budget or the casual income account, or an increase in assessments.

The Assembly also agreed to a proposal by the Executive Board that $2,585,000 be spent from the Real Estate Fund to finance several capital improvements in WHO facilities. The major expenditure was for a new telephone exchange at Geneva headquarters, replacing one that the Secretariat said was on the verge of breakdown and incompatible with recent changes in the Swiss telephone system.

Scale of Asessments

The Assembly also adopted a new scale of assessments for 1990–1991, modeled on the revised UN scale. The United States assessment remained at 25 percent of the budget.

Payment of Assessments

On April 30, 34 member states still owed all of their assessments for 1988, and the Secretariat expressed concern that these late payments would have a negative impact on WHO operations. Assistant Director General Furth pointed out that a new incentive payment scheme had gone into effect at the beginning of 1989. The plan would allocate casual income to countries in accordance with the dates of their payment of assessments. If they paid late in the year, they would get no credit of casual income toward their annual assessment. The Netherlands Delegation complained that, of the total shortfall of $41 million at the end of 1988, $27 million was owed by just one country (the United States); it suggested that the WHO budgetary problems could not be laid at the feet of small countries that were assessed only minimal amounts.

Suspension of the Vote

In 1988 the Assembly had set in motion a new system for suspending the votes of member states more than 2 years in arrears. That Assembly applied the new rule to five countries, effective in 1989. One of the five had met the requirement for adequate payments, but the other four—Benin, Comoros, Dominican Republic and Sierra Leone—automatically lost their vote in 1989. In 1989 six other countries were more than 2 years in arrears in their payments, and it was proposed that the same policy be applied to them, effective at the 1990 Assembly. However, several developing countries argued that the affected countries—Burundi, Democratic Kampuchea, Grenada, Lebanon, Liberia and Mauritania—were among the poorest member states and should not be punished for nonpayment. Eventually, the resolution denying the vote to these six was rejected by a vote of 25 in favor (U.S.), 29 against, and 30 abstaining. The denial of the vote for the other four countries was left standing.

U.S. Government Payments

At the beginning of 1989, the United States owed WHO $27.8 million for assessments in previous years because of shortfalls in appropriations (see earlier editions of *United States Participation in the UN* for details). The assessment on the United States for 1989 was $71.2 million. The United States intended to pay virtually the full amount of the 1989 assessment before the end of the year, utilizing funds from the appropriation for FY 1990, which began on October 1, 1989. However, complications in the appropriations process delayed the availability of the funds. The U.S. Government paid WHO $32,012,000 on December 27, 1989. U.S. officials said they hoped to pay WHO another $33.3 million in January 1990 and most of the balance of the 1989 assessment, $5.9 million, later in 1990. WHO records at the end of 1989 showed the United States in arrears by $66,273,385.

U.S voluntary contributions to programs outside the regular budget continued, as in the past, and increased in size. These contributions—primarily from appropriations for the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Public Health Service—were especially targeted to address high-priority disease prevention and control programs.

The United States was the leading extrabudgetary contributor to WHO during the 1988–1989 biennium, providing a total of $64,947,509. This included $45,407,164 contributed in 1989 alone, an increase of 132 percent over the 1988 contributions of $19,540,345. The major U.S. contributions in 1989 were for the Global Program on AIDS ($33 million), the Onchocerciasis Control Program ($5 million), and $4.9 million for a variety of activities covered by the WHO Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion.

Other countries making significant voluntary contributions during the 1988–1989 biennium were Sweden ($52.2 million), Netherlands ($27.3 million), Denmark ($26.6 million), Norway ($26.2 million), Italy ($21.8 million), Japan ($19.8 million), Canada ($15.7 million), the Federal Republic of Germany ($13.3 million) and Switzerland ($12.2 million).

Tribute to Furth

Delegations from the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom expressed special appreciation to Assistant Director General Warren Furth on his retirement in 1989. Furth, an American who had served with the ILO before joining WHO in 1972, was praised for his work in setting high standards for WHO budgetary and administrative activity, which was often cited as a model in the UN system agencies, and for successfully piloting WHO through numerous financial crises. After his retirement, Furth was replaced on a temporary basis by another American, Edward Uhde, Director of Budget and Finance, who was to serve as Acting Assistant Director General until a full-time replacement was appointed.

POLITICAL ISSUES

Members of the Executive Board continued to take opportunities at public meetings to condemn the introduction of irrelevant political issues at sessions of the World Health Assembly. Following a divisive and time-consuming debate at the 1989 Assembly on a membership issue, the Board members urged Director General Nakajima to take all possible steps to avoid such confrontations.

Dr. Nakajima proposed moving the Assembly from its traditionally scheduled time in early May to the end of October. He argued that the Assembly was always scheduled as the first of the meetings of the major UN system agencies each year and it tended to take the brunt of political initiatives, even when they had no relevance to WHO. Board members said they could not decide on such an issue without consultation with member states, and they urged the Director General to raise the issue before the six regional committees. At their meetings in September, the committees took opposing positions on the proposal; the issue was to be decided by the Board at its January 1990 meeting.

PLO Application for Membership

A major focal point of the 1989 Assembly was the application for membership in WHO of the self-proclaimed state of "Palestine," submitted in April by the leadership of the PLO. The United States took the view that the PLO did not satisfy the generally accepted international law criteria for statehood. Secretary Baker on May 1 issued an announcement saying that "the United States vigorously opposes the admission of the PLO to membership in the World Health Organization or any other UN agency. We have worked, and will continue to work," he said, "to convince others of the harm that the PLO's admission would cause to the Middle East peace process and to the UN system." He suggested that a withholding of U.S. funds would be an inevitable response to PLO membership or the enhancement of the PLO's observer status in any international organization.

Because of the possibility of PLO admission to WHO, numerous members of Congress wrote to express their concern. Legislation was introduced (ultimately passed as Public Law 101-246, section 414) saying that no funds authorized to be appropriated by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act or any other act "shall be available for the United Nations or any specialized agency thereof which accords the PLO the same standing as member states." WHO Director General

Nakajima flew to Washington to discuss the issue with U.S. officials, and he later flew to Tunis to discuss it with Yasser Arafat, leader of the PLO.

In the meantime, U.S. embassies around the world were asked to convey Secretary Baker's position on the matter to officials of WHO member countries and to point out that U.S. contributions, amounting to 25 percent of the WHO budget, were in jeopardy. DHHS Secretary Sullivan wrote a personal message to health ministers around the world to make the same point.

The entire first week of the 2-week Assembly was taken up with discussion of how the PLO application was to be handled. Finally, at the end of one continuous 8-hour session of the Assembly plenary, ending at 10:30 p.m. on May 12, the Assembly agreed to defer action on the application, to ask Director General Nakajima to study the application, and to report on the outcome of his studies to the 1990 Assembly "for its decision."

Resolution WHA42.1 also contained a paragraph in which the Assembly "expresses the hope that the Palestinian people will be fully represented within the World Health Organization by their legitimate representatives." It also asked the Director General "to undertake immediately . . . further assistance to improve the health conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories." The U.S. Delegation had argued against these paragraphs in informal consultation, saying they were unnecessary.

The complex procedural situation led to six separate votes. On May 10 Austria's motion to adjourn debate for 2 days was approved by a vote of 56 (U.S.) to 47, with 20 abstaining. On May 12 the resolution seeking deferral of action on the application for 1 year was introduced by Tonga. Nicaragua then introduced amendments that would have reversed the meaning of the resolution and permitted the admission of the PLO. Libya moved to close the debate, and this was approved by a vote of 74 to 4 (U.S.), with 28 abstaining. The United States voted no because it felt the procedural situation had not been made clear.

Then the United Kingdom and Zaire moved that no amendments to the Tonga resolution be considered, a proposal that would have eliminated the Nicaraguan amendment. A proposal that the U.K.-Zaire motion be considered by a secret ballot was approved by a vote of 78 (U.S.) to 43, with 24 abstaining. The Assembly then approved the U.K.-Zaire motion by a vote of 80 to 49, with 19 abstentions. Tonga had asked that its resolution deferring action on the application also be considered by secret ballot, and this was approved by a vote of 67 (U.S.) to 48, with 23 abstaining. Finally, the resolution itself was approved by secret ballot, 83 to 47, with 20 abstaining. The U.S. Delegation did not reveal how it voted.

Assistant Secretary of State Bolton, at a press conference immediately after the vote, called the decision a "defeat" for the PLO's attempt to upgrade its observer status and a "victory for the health of the people of the world." He said "the United States is pleased that the international community has effectively rejected the PLO's application . . . We will continue to oppose PLO membership in the other agencies of the UN system." Mr. Bolton said that the United States had

> . . . argued very strenuously that admission of a nonstate, such as the PLO, would be a terribly adverse precedent, not only for WHO but for many others. A number of governments appreciated that if a state could be created where none existed in the Middle East, there may be numerous other regions in the world where states that don't exist might also be created.

Mr. Bolton said that he was confident the Administration would push vigorously and successfully in Congress for the approval of the assessed contribution for WHO.

Action Regarding Israel

The customary agenda item regarding health conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories was taken up by the Assembly. Arab states introduced a resolution that was more moderate than those presented in previous years. Paragraphs regarding the Israeli reaction to the uprising in the territories received favorable reaction from many delegations. However, Israel's Delegation said it was surprised that a resolution addressing Israel's "inhumanity" in the wake of the *intifada* (the uprising) could be put forward by countries that had devastated the civilian population of Beirut with artillery shelling and by Iraq, which used chemical weapons. Israel said it would cooperate with no activity that was mandated by the proposed resolution.

U.S. Delegate Boyer said the United States would have to vote no on a resolution, such as this one, that was unbalanced and contained such a harsh, one-sided attack on a member state of WHO. He said the proposed creation at WHO headquarters of a new organizational unit to deal with the occupied territories was outside WHO's normal method of operation, which did not involve country desks at headquarters. The U.S. Delegate also objected to the repeated uses of the word "Palestine" in the text. He said these references implied a political status that did not exist and would need to be changed if there was to be consensus in future resolutions on the subject.

The resolution was then approved in committee by a vote of 69 to 2 (U.S. and Israel), with 32 abstaining. In the plenary, Israel decided not to call for another vote, but again made a speech condemning the result and saying it would not cooperate with any requests in such a hostile text.

One of the components of the resolution (WHA42.14) was a request for development of a health plan to meet the health needs of the Palestinian people. Later in 1989, Director General Nakajima developed a proposal for a health program totaling $18 million and solicited extrabudgetary contributions for it from potential donors. At the end of the year, some contributions had been made and details of the health plan were still under discussion.

African Resolutions

African states once again presented the same resolution that had appeared in previous years, calling for assistance to front-line states in southern Africa as well as for aid to national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity. The U.S. Delegation had said in previous years that it could not accept the harsh language of the resolution and sought modification of the 1989 text, without success. The United States requested a vote in the committee, and the resoluton was adopted by a vote of 94 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 (U.K.) abstaining. There was no separate vote in the plenary.

The Assembly also approved, by consensus, a resolution seeking assistance for reconstruction and development of the health system of Namibia. This included a paragraph, inserted by Angola, acknowledging the role of the United States in sponsoring the New York agreements on Namibia.

PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The 34th meeting of the 38-member Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) Directing Council was held in Washington on September 25–29. The Council adopted an effective working budget for 1990–1991 of $130,023,000, up 7.3 percent from the 1988–1989 budget. All of the increase was attributed to inflation; no real growth was included. The U.S. Government, which pays 61.27 percent of the budget, was to be assessed $39,721,363 in each year of the biennium. Due to shortfalls in appropriations for prior years, at the end of 1989 the United States owed PAHO $14,310,675.

At the Directing Council meeting, the U.S. Delegation praised PAHO Director Carlyle Guerra de Macedo (Brazil) for continuing to adhere to the principle of zero real growth and for budgeting cost increases at a level lower than that permitted by WHO. The U.S. Delegation pressed again for development of mechanisms that could better involve PAHO member countries in the determination of priorities within the budget.

DHHS Assistant Secretary Mason, the chief U.S. Delegate, urged PAHO to strengthen the links between WHO collaborating centers in the region of the Americas, to establish specific goals for the iodine deficiency program, to sharpen PAHO goals for environmental activities and to link the Director's annual report to targets established in the program budget.

Cuba complained at the meeting that it was not getting its fair share of extrabudgetary resources contributed to PAHO because U.S. AID, the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank had policies of excluding

Cuba from their programs. Director Macedo said that Cuba was receiving far more in PAHO resources than it was paying in assessments. He said member states needed to have good projects to justify specific requests for assistance. While he could make no changes in the policies of donors, he said he would work to find other means to ensure that no country was excluded from PAHO program activities.

Acting as the WHO regional committee for the Americas, the Council agreed by consensus to oppose a WHO proposal to move the annual World Health Assembly from May to October. The U.S. Delegation was the only one that said it could support the move.

The Council also adopted resolutions on AIDS, polio eradication, malaria, blindness, drug abuse, the use of tobacco and the damage to health systems resulting from Hurricane Hugo. Dr. Carl Kupfer, Director of the U.S. National Eye Institute, addressed the Council and urged the strengthening of blindness prevention programs throughout the region.

In a discussion of fellowships, the U.S. Delegation asked for more regular reporting to the members of PAHO on the 12-month residency program for young health professionals at PAHO headquarters and more openness about the selection process. The delegation had suggested previously that the program was expensive and asked whether PAHO considered this a higher priority than regional health programs.

INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER

The 14-member Governing Council met at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) headquarters in Lyon, France, on May 4–5. The Council adopted a new regular budget for 1990–1991 of $26,126,000, up 3.67 percent from the 1988–1989 budget. The new budget reflected cost increases of 8.59 percent, a 3.33 percent decrease because of a reduction in the exchange rate, and a 1.59 percent real decrease in program activity.

The IARC budget traditionally is financed in part with money from the Governing Council Special Fund (made up of interest earnings, exchange rate gains and other miscellaneous income) and the balance through assessments on member states. In preparation of the 1988–1989 budget, $6 million had been available from the Special Fund. However, only $500,000 was available for the 1990–1991 budget, and several Council members complained about the resulting sizeable increase in the assessments. The budget was approved by a vote of 12 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstaining (U.S.S.R. and Belgium, both concerned about the higher assessments.) The U.S. assessment, amounting to 10.22 percent of the budget, was set at $1,252,346 for 1990 and $1,365,963 for 1991.

The Council members were generally pleased with the work program put forward in the 1990–1991 budget proposal. However, Governing Council members followed up on the U.S. initiative in past years to ask the Scientific Council to make recommendations on program priorities, and lamented that this had not been done. U.S. Delegate Boyer said the Governing Council would feel more comfortable with the proposed program if it knew that the Scientific Council had reviewed the general allocation of resources among the programs and had approved or disapproved or commented on them. The Scientific Council chairman said the task was too difficult to perform. Nevertheless, the Governing Council asked once again that this be done for the next biennial budget proposal.

WHO Director General Nakajima addressed the Council and praised the work of IARC and its relationship to WHO. He pointed out that 30 percent of cancer incidence is related to tobacco, and another 30 percent to dietary and nutritional factors.

The Council discussed a proposal that IARC create a new cancer prevention unit. After lengthy discussion about whether such a unit at IARC would duplicate work already being pursued by WHO, it was agreed that further study would be given to the problem so that it could be reviewed at future Council meetings.

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

In 1989 the International Maritime Organization (IMO) continued its cooperation with U.S. initiatives to counter terrorist acts at sea and aboard ships. Conferences were sponsored in the Caribbean in May and in the Mediterranean in August to promote new measures to prevent unlawful acts against passengers and crews on board ships, and to review practical procedures for implementation.

The IMO also elected a new Secretary General, began work on a new international convention against oil spills, and proposed new steps to protect the marine environment and ensure the highest standards of marine safety at sea. With Monaco joining the IMO in 1989, the organization now consists of 134 full members and one associate member. Since its inception in 1959, the IMO has had its headquarters in London.

ASSEMBLY

Admiral Paul Yost, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, headed the U.S. Delegation to the biennial IMO Assembly, which met in London on October 9–20. The alternate representatives were Rear Admiral Joel Sipes, U.S. Coast Guard, and Mary Ann Kekich, Department of State. The Assembly called for the development of a new international response and preparedness convention for catastrophic oil spills. This proposal resulted from a U.S. initiative presented by President Bush at the Economic Summit Conference in July, following the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill in Alaska. Additional discussions focused on the call for a review of existing rules, regulations and practices with respect to the marine transport of hazardous wastes in light of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, and the need for protection and preservation of the marine environment.

The Assembly approved by acclamation the appointment of William A. O'Neil of Canada as Secretary General, effective January 1, 1990. Mr. O'Neil, former Commissioner of the Canadian Coast Guard and recently president of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, replaced C. P. Srivastava (India), who for 16 years had served as IMO's Secretary General.

The Assembly also approved a budget of 25,410,600 pounds sterling (about $43,068,814) for the 1990–1991 biennium, as well as a resolution calling for renewed efforts to collect assessments which are in arrears. The new budget was a 20.2 percent nominal increase over the 1988–1989 budget, consisting of minus 2.5 percent real growth, 15.3 percent in mandatory cost increases, 6.5 percent inflation, and exchange rate increases of .9 percent. The United States attempted to garner support for a budget with nominal growth under 14 percent, but ultimately joined the consensus on the budget that was adopted in light of reductions achieved from the initial draft proposed by the Secretary General. The 1990 U.S. assessment under the new budget (5.38 percent) will amount to 637,103 pounds sterling, or about $1.08 million.

COUNCIL

The 62nd and 63rd sessions of the Council were held in June and October. The 62nd session recommended the appointment of William O'Neil, whom the United States supported, as Secretary General. Other candidates were Thomas Aboague Mensah (Ghana), Leif Nygaard (Norway) and Ghazi Othman Nazer (Saudi Arabia).

The main issue at both sessions of the Council was the continuing difficult financial situation facing the organization as a result of nonpayment or late payment of assessed contributions. Of the 3,858,940 pounds sterling owed to IMO as of December 31, 1989, slightly more than half was owed by Panama.

The United States paid the balance of its 1989 assessment (565,469 pounds sterling) on October 19, 1989, during the 16th Assembly. This amount was paid from FY 1990 funds. As of December 31, 1989, the United States was current in the payment of its assessment to the organization.

The United States was reelected to Category "A" (states with the largest interest in providing international shipping service) of the Council membership. With nine countries running for eight seats in that category, the United States received the fifth largest number of votes, 97 of a possible 119.

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

The Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) is the IMO's senior technical committee, with 10 technical subcommittees. The U.S. Delegation, headed by Rear Admiral Joel Sipes, attended the 57th session of the MSC in April. The Committee developed an amendment to the 1974 Safety of Life at Sea Convention, which will require new dry cargo vessels to be able to maintain their stability even after damage from collision or grounding. Guidelines on Management for Safe Ship Operation and Pollution Prevention were developed and forwarded to the Assembly for adoption. The Committee also completed the revision of the Code for the Construction and Equipment of Mobile Offshore Drilling Units, 1989. The code resulted from a 5-year effort involving close coordination between the technical subcommittees. The MSC also reviewed the work programs of the 10 subcommittees in detail.

LEGAL COMMITTEE

In April an IMO diplomatic conference in London adopted a new International Convention on Salvage, which had been developed by the Legal Committee. The treaty introduced a revised compensation framework with environmental incentives for salvors. This was intended both to promote the viability of the private sector salvage industry and to safeguard the marine environment during salvage operations. International implementation of the new Salvage Convention, which requires a minimum of 15 nations for entry into force, was expected to result in substantial benefits for the marine environment worldwide.

In September the IMO/UNCTAD Joint Intergovernmental Group of Experts (JIGE) on Maritime Liens and Mortgages and Related Subjects held its sixth and final session in London. The JIGE, which was a cooperative effort of the IMO Legal Committee and the UNCTAD Working Group on International Shipping Legislation, completed a new Draft International Convention on Maritime Liens and Mortgages. It was expected that the draft treaty, which is to enhance the security of vessel mortgagees in order to promote the worldwide availability of vessel financing, will be submitted to an IMO/UNCTAD diplomatic conference within the next several years.

In October the IMO Assembly adopted a new resolution on Cooperation in Maritime Casualty Investigations which had been approved by the Legal Committee at its 60th session in October 1988. This joint U.S.-Liberian initiative established a new comprehensive framework for consultation and cooperation among nations in the event of marine casualties with international dimensions. After implemention by IMO member nations, the new resolution was expected to contribute substantially to improving the effectiveness of such investigations.

The Legal Committee held its 61st session on September 28–29. The Committee discussed its future work program, and agreed that the question of liability and compensation related to maritime carriage of hazardous and noxious substances would be a priority during the next biennium.

Committee discussions focused on the possibility of developing a scheme that would involve sharing the cost of compensation between shipowners and cargo interests as a way of promoting equity and ensuring the maximum possible compensation for potential claimants.

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Chairman of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) since 1988, Rear Admiral Sidney Wallace, USCG (Ret.), chaired the 27th session of the MEPC in March 1989. The Committee unanimously adopted amendments to the International Code for Construction and Equipment of Ships Carrying Dangerous Chemicals in Bulk (IBC and BCH Codes) and Annex II, Regulations for the Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk, of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as amended by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto (MARPOL 73/78).

The Committee also agreed to a plan of action for fuel oil quality standards (and their potential impact on air pollution); considered the issue of a new Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78 for the prevention of pollution by noxious solid substance in bulk; continued revisions of the IMO Manual on Chemical Pollution in the section dealing with search and recovery of packaged goods lost at sea; and agreed to begin a review of the draft IMO guidelines of Management for Safe Ship Operation and Pollution Prevention.

At an abbreviated 28th session held October 17, the Committee unanimously adopted amendments to Annex V of MARPOL 73/78 for establishing the North Sea as a special area for the prevention of garbage pollution from ships, and a U.S. proposal to strengthen regulation 6(c) concerning disposal of synthetic fishing materials into the sea because of the significant hazard of entanglement to marine life and sea mammals.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

The 27th triennial session of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Assembly was held in Montreal from September 19 to October 6, with 848 participants accredited. The United States was reelected to the Council. The Legal Commission elected Irene Howie (Legal Counsel of the Federal Aviation Administration) as its second vice chairman, and agreed that a new international regime should be developed for easier detection of plastic explosives. In November Dr. Assad Kotaite was elected unanimously as president of the ICAO Council for the sixth consecutive time. Before assuming the presidency of the Council in 1976, Dr. Kotaite had been ICAO's Secretary General for 6 years and Lebanon's representative on the Council for 11 years.

In 1989 Bhutan and Mongolia became parties to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, thus increasing the membership of ICAO to 162 contracting states.

SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST CIVIL AVIATION

During 1989 ICAO continued to give top priority to the security of international civil aviation. The destruction by a bomb of Pan American World Airways' Flight 103, a Boeing 747, over Lockerbie, Scotland, in December 1988, with the loss of 270 lives, led the governments of United States and the United Kingdom to call for a ministerial-level meeting of the ICAO Council. The special sessions were held February 15 and 16. The United States was represented in the Council by Secretary of Transportation Samuel K. Skinner. The United Kingdom and several other Council member states were also represented by cabinet ministers.

The resolution adopted by a consensus of the ICAO Council strongly condemned all acts of unlawful interference against international civil aviation. It also called on ICAO member states to increase their cooperation with ICAO's legal and technical staffs to combat such acts. The Council also gave instructions to the ICAO Committee on Unlawful Interference and other appropriate bodies to determine whether new ICAO security standards or amendments to existing Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPS) and guidance material were necessary, particularly to meet an increased security threat.

The third meeting of the Aviation Security Panel, held at ICAO's headquarters in Montreal from May 29 to June 9, recommended that a note be added to ICAO Annex 17, which deals with security. This note, which was supported by the United States and adopted by the Council, states that "special attention must be paid to the threat posed by explosive devices concealed in, or using electric, electronic or battery-operated items carried as hand baggage and/or in checked baggage." The U.S. member argued strongly for additional action by the panel. However, a consensus emerged among the other 13 members that further changes to Annex 17 could be deferred for later development as ICAO SARPS, and that attention should be focused on implementation of existing provisions in the annex.

The ICAO Council also discussed the need for easier detection of plastic explosives by airport screening devices. It proposed development of a legal regime under which an additive would be incorporated into plastic explosives at the time of manufacture in order to facilitate their detection. This proposal was included in the resolution of the ministerial-level Council meeting in February and endorsed by the UN Security Council in June.

The 139 contracting states attending the 27th triennial session of the Assembly, held at ICAO headquarters from September 19 to October 6 unanimously agreed that ICAO should give highest priority in its legal work program to this proposal. Identification of a preferred additive for use in the manufacture of explosives, and other related technical measures, were the subject of meetings in March and November of the ICAO *Ad Hoc* Group of Specialists on the Detection of Explosives, which includes the United States. At the end of the year, a draft convention was being prepared.

The Assembly also adopted a strong resolution against unlawful interference, specifically the destruction of civil aircraft in flight. This resolution was initiated by France in view of the bombing of its UTA Flight 172 over Niger on the opening day of the Assembly. The resolution incorporated elements of a draft resolution circulated by the United States and called on the Council to complete in the shortest possible time the security program adopted in its resolution of February 16. The Assembly endorsed the proposed program for a new ICAO mechanism for increased security assistance to states, which had also been recommended in the February resolution.

During the meeting of the Assembly, the United States pledged $100,000 as a special voluntary contribution toward a trust fund established within ICAO on aviation security. Also, the United States offered to ICAO the use of two experts from the Federal Aviation Administration to work on ICAO's aviation security program. The experts were to begin work in ICAO headquarters in 1990.

OTHER ASSEMBLY ACTION

The U.S. Delegation to the Assembly was headed by Edmund Stohr, the U.S. Representative to ICAO, and included representatives from the Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration and Department of State. Admiral James Busey, newly appointed as Federal Aviation Administrator, made an opening statement for the United States.

In a secret ballot, the Assembly reelected the United States to the 33-member ICAO Council in Category I (10 states of chief importance in air traffic); the United States received 123 out of a possible 131 votes. A strong effort was made by 41 African states to increase the Council from 33 members to "at least 36 states" by having the Assembly immediately approve, without the required advance notification or justification, another amendment to the convention. The Assembly decided that the Council should study the matter with a view to convening an extraordinary session of the Assembly in 1990 to consider the issue. The Assembly approved, with U.S. support, an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation which, when ratified by the requisite 108 contracting states, will increase the size of the ICAO Air Navigation Commission from 15 to 19 members.

The Assembly could not reach agreement on the matter of possible noise restrictions on subsonic jet aircraft that do not meet the noise certification requirements in Annex 16. Consequently, this subject also was referred to the extraordinary Assembly on the understanding that no unilateral action would be taken by states in the meantime. A resolution was adopted urging the Council to elaborate with a high degree of priority concrete measures to prevent and eliminate use of illicit drugs and other substances by crew members, air traffic controllers, mechanics and other staff of international civil aviation.

The Assembly urged states to take measures, in consultation with users and airport operators, to alleviate airspace and airport congestion without prejudice to safety. Through its Economic Commission, the Assembly also reviewed the Council's work in the air transport field and reviewed the issues of trade in services, tariff enforcement and computer reservation systems.

The Assembly approved, by consensus, a regular budget of $106.7 million for the 1990–1992 triennium. The budget, in accord with the recommendations of the Finance Committee and the Council, represented negative growth of 3 percent in real terms from the 1987–1989 triennial budget. The Assembly also approved a Council recommendation regarding the disposition of $8.8 million in unrealized budget surplus from previous years. As approved, the surplus will be disposed of as follows: (1) $2 million toward an increase in the ICAO Working Capital Fund; (2) $6.2 million to be returned to member states as credits toward their 1990–1992 assessments (the United States is assessed 25 percent of the total); and (3) $600,000 returned to those member states which qualify under the ICAO incentive payment scheme, according to the dates on which they paid their assessments (the U.S. share amounts to $62,000).

With Assembly approval, ICAO adopted a new program budget format for 1990–1992 to bring it in line with other major UN system agencies. In 1990–1992 the new program budget format will be used concurrently with ICAO's traditional (appropriation category) budget to facilitate ICAO's complete transition to the program budget in 1993–1995.

IRAN AIR 655 INCIDENT

In March the Council returned to a discussion of Iran Air Flight 655, which was mistakenly shot down by the *USS Vincennes* during a military engagement in the Persian Gulf in July 1988. This incident had been the subject of an ICAO fact-finding investigation and report in 1988 (see *United States Participation in the UN, 1988*). After discussion at three meetings, the Council adopted a resolution reaffirming its policy of condemning the use of weapons against civil aircraft in flight, deeply deploring the tragic incident, and urging states to take all necessary measures to safeguard the safety of air navigation.

ICAO STATISTICS DIVISION

The eighth session of the ICAO Statistics Division was held at ICAO headquarters from April 11 to 20; 47 contracting states, including the United

States, attended. The 17 recommendations adopted included elimination of the reporting form for fleet and traffic statistics of small carriers; it was argued that much of the data could be collected by other means. The division also recommended enhancement of the ICAO programs for collection of data for traffic by flight stage and airport financial statistics.

The division emphasized the need for increased availability and timeliness of ICAO statistics. A recommendation was made that ICAO should develop, as a matter of high priority, a comprehensive program for increased automation of the collection, analysis, and transmission of aviation statistics among ICAO members, aviation authorities, airlines, airports and other interested parties.

ICAO REGIONAL AIR NAVIGATION MEETING

The Second Caribbean/South American Regional Air Navigation (CAR/SAM RAN) meeting was held at Santiago, Chile, May 2–20. More than 12 years had elapsed since a major ICAO meeting had focused attention on the regional plan of air navigation facilities and services for that area. Because there had been many important technological developments in that time, the report of the meeting contained more than 220 recommendations and conclusions for final action by the ICAO Council. The meeting, which was attended by representatives of 33 contracting states and 9 international organizations, selected the chairman of the U.S. Delegation, Garland Castleberry (FAA), to chair the implementation working group.

CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS PANEL

The second session of the Continuing Airworthiness Panel was held at ICAO headquarters from November 27 to December 6. This meeting, which was attended by members from 16 contracting states and observers from three international organizations, took the following actions, all of them supported by the United States:

— Agreement on a description of continuing airworthiness requirements, ranging from the time aircraft are designed through production and service life until they are retired;

— Proposed amendment of ICAO Annex 6, Part I, on Operation of Aircraft, to establish or strengthen requirements to ensure that aircraft operators continue airworthiness of aircraft in their fleets;

— Proposed amendment of ICAO Annex 8, on Airworthiness of Aircraft, to establish or strengthen requirements of national airworthiness authorities in their roles as states of registry and/or design for continuing airworthiness assurance;

— Establishment of plans for guidance material to supplement the proposed new provisions of Annexes 6 and 8 by a new ICAO continuing airworthiness manual, as well as by possible revisions to the Airworthiness Technical Manual;

— Agreement to examine the implications of leasing arrangements and aging aircraft in relation to airworthiness.

Working groups were set up to speed the work in each of these areas. The Panel also concluded that the proposed revisions to Annexes 6 and 8, if implemented, would make a significant contribution to assuring the continuing airworthiness of all aircraft.

International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

In 1989 no countries acceded to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) convention. As of December 31, 1989, the membership remained at 166 countries.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL, 44TH SESSION

The ITU's Administrative Council (44th session) met in Geneva from January 30 to February 3, with closing meetings in Nice, France, from May 24 to 25, coinciding with the opening of the ITU's 13th Plenipotentiary Conference. All decisions of consequence were deferred to the conference. The Council, of which the United States is a member, reviewed the draft 1990 Union expenditure budget, which formed the basis for deciding upon the budget ceilings which were adopted at the conference. In other actions, the Council reviewed and endorsed a number of basic documents for discussion at the conference, including documents on publications policy, financial and other implications of adding additional working languages to the Union, upgrading computer applications for frequency management, electronic remote access to the International Frequency Registration Board data banks, and the changing nature of the telecommunications environment. A surprising development was the announcement at the January session by incumbent Secretary General Richard Butler of Australia that he would not run for a second term at the Plenipotentiary Conference.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

The ITU held its 13th Plenipotentiary Conference from May 23 to June 30 in Nice, France. Over 1,100 delegates from 143 of the ITU's member countries and 15 observer organizations attended this first meeting of the ITU's supreme body since 1982. Ambassador C. Travis Marshall headed the 40-member U.S. Delegation. The principal purposes of the conference were to revise the ITU's basic instrument, consider proposals for restructuring the ITU, and establish the policies to guide the Union's activities until the next Plenipotentiary

Conference, including: (1) establishing the program of conferences for revising the Radio Regulations; (2) setting annual spending ceilings until the 1994 Plenipotentiary Conference; (3) reviewing staff matters; and (4) electing officials.

POLITICAL ISSUES

During the preceding Plenipotentiary Conference at Nairobi in 1982, attempts to expel Israel from the ITU consumed nearly 4 of the Conference's 6 weeks. Careful advance preparation facilitated a less disruptive handling of political issues at Nice. Israeli-Arab issues were the most difficult. An anti-apartheid resolution passed after minimum debate. Cuban statements attacking the United States required a rebuttal.

The Mideast

An early attempt to curtail debate and press for a secret procedural vote on a proposal by Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Syria to expel Israel became stalled in parliamentary maneuvers. After further behind-the-scenes discussions, Arab members agreed to limit themselves to an hour of presentations in support of their position. Ambassador Sonia Landau, U.S. Coordinator and Director, Bureau of International Communications and Information Policy, Department of State, and a senior member of the U.S. Delegation, presented the U.S. position opposing the Arab initiatives as contrary to the concept of universality and of a broad political nature inappropriate for consideration in a technical specialized agency. The Representative of Saudi Arabia, chosen by the Arab delegations to coordinate the Israeli expulsion effort, then publicly agreed that, having presented their case, the resolution's sponsors would not pursue further proposals to expel Israel.

Midway through the conference, Saudi Arabia introduced a resolution, cosponsored by 28 countries, condemning Israeli actions regarding telecommunications services in the occupied territories and directing the Administrative Council to form a committee to study the matter. Ambassador Landau spoke forcefully against this resolution. The U.S. Delegation obtained the necessary four cosponsors (The Netherlands, Canada, Denmark and New Zealand) to call for a secret ballot. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 61 to 36 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. Saudi Arabia also proposed a change in the draft language of the new basic instrument which would have allowed expulsion of a member for "proven destruction of telecommunications facilities." Saudi Arabia did not raise this issue in plenary session, however, after the United States and France obtained the support of other Security Council Permanent Members in opposition to the proposed change.

Despite speculation that the PLO would seek full membership in the ITU at Nice, it did not apply. However, the conference approved without debate a Secretariat proposal to change the PLO nameplate to read "Palestine" without any change in the PLO's observer status, on the basis that such action would be in accord with precedents set at UN headquarters in New York. The United States and Israel made brief statements against the change for the record.

Southern Africa

The United States, the European Community, the Nordics and four other countries spoke in opposition to a resolution sponsored by 29 countries continuing the suspension of South Africa from the ITU, first approved at the 1965 Plenipotentiary Conference. While expressing revulsion at apartheid, opponents, including Ambassador Marshall speaking for the United States, objected to suspending any member, a step not provided for in the ITU basic instrument and contrary to the principle of universality. The resolution passed in a nonsecret vote, 67 to 22 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions, plus 47 not voting. This result revealed more than half the members not in support.

Cuba

In an address before the plenary, the Cuban First Vice Minister for Communications accused the United States of violating ITU Radio Regulations. The U.S. right of reply was exercised through a brief statement by Delegation Vice Chairman Daniel Clare and a longer note disseminated as a Conference document. The Cuban Representative made a counter-response and received permission to incorporate a written reply, as the United States had done. In further response, the U.S. Delegation made a written counter-declaration.

STRUCTURAL ISSUES

During the Conference, there were numerous proposals to modify the structure of, and relationships among, organs of the Union, including rotation of Administrative Council Members; merger of the International Consultative Committees (CCIs); restructuring of the International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB); and abolition of the Federal structure of the ITU in favor of a Chief Executive management structure. Proposed changes were not developed in detail and advantages in terms of management or programmatic efficiency were not clear.

Pressed by the developing countries, the Conference agreed to establish a new independent development organ, the Bureau for the Development of Telecommunications (BDT). In a compromise, the Conference also prescribed that an in-depth study of the entire ITU be conducted before any decisions were taken on other major structural or organizational changes. The study would be conducted by a High-Level Committee (HLC) of up to 21 member representatives, to be chosen by the Administrative Council at an extraordinary session in November 1989. The U.S. Delegation did not oppose this compromise. The U.S. Delegation succeeded in obtaining adoption of new procedures which expand the role of scientific and industrial organizations (SIOs) in the work of the CCIs.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A major action of the conference was the approval of new global budgetary ceilings for the period 1990–1994. Actual budgets will be approved at the annual sessions of the Administrative Council. Established spending levels can be exceeded to reflect increases in the Swiss inflation rate, mandated changes in the UN Common System and exchange rate fluctuations. Generally during the last 7 years, the ITU has adhered to the goals of minimum budget growth and limitations on nondiscretionary cost increases.

The final plenary meeting accepted a total ceiling of 600 million Swiss francs (approximately $375 million) for the period 1990–1994, with a ceiling of 115 million Swiss francs (approximately $72 million) for 1990. The total ceiling included a large commitment of resources to the new Bureau for Development of Telecommunications: SFR 15 million in 1990, increasing gradually to SFR 22.5 million in 1994. Despite an early instruction from the Finance Committee to assign priorities to decisions with financial implications, the functional committees generally did not do so.

The ceilings approved at the conference represented a substantial scaling back of what the United States believed to be overly ambitious programs put forward by the Conference committees. Even so, the ceilings agreed upon represented an increase in real terms of approximately 4 percent on an adjusted basis. Because this exceeded the U.S. target of zero real growth for international organization assessed budgets, the U.S. Delegation disassociated itself from, but did not block, consensus adoption of the budget ceilings. The Conference also expanded the number of contributory unit classes for members (in the ITU, governments choose the level, or unit class, which they will contribute), including a new 40-unit class and a new minimum 1/16 unit class for the least developed countries (previously, the highest and lowest classes were 30 units and 1/8 unit, respectively). Because of the minimal effect on overall income, the United States posed no objection to the lower minimum contribution. The U.S. Government chose to pay 30 units, approximately 7.6 percent of the ITU ordinary budget in 1989. U.S. private sector contributions made up approximately another 2 percent. The United States helped to stave off attempts at the conference to increase the minimum contributory level of the private sector participants in the work of the CCIs.

Prior to the Conference, the U.S. Delegation had received authorization to rationalize the persistent deficit carried by the ITU due to a shortfall in support costs for technical assistance and cooperation projects executed by the ITU on behalf of the UN Development Program (described in *United States Participation in the UN, 1986*, pages 238–239). It was decided by the Finance Committee to fund nearly SFR 4 million in UNDP shortfall costs from the regular budget for technical cooperation. The U.S. Delegation did not object to this procedure.

A plan put forth by the Secretary General to shift SFR 3 million annually from the publications budget into the regular budget, opposed by the United States, was not approved, but the publications account was relieved of any obligation to generate excess revenue.

The Conference decided to make six languages coequal in the new basic instrument. However, the Conference approved arrangements to limit the financial consequences for the upcoming financial period by setting an annual ceiling of SFR 3 million on costs for Arabic, Chinese and Russian language services. The United States opposed full language comparability because of its potential cost.

Staff pensions were a troublesome issue at the Nice Conference. For some years, ITU staff intending to retire in Europe have argued that their pensions should be based on their Geneva salaries, and have disrupted ITU meetings to emphasize their discontent. Supported by the United States, Committee Five on staff matters approved a resolution that the staff believed undermined its position on this issue. However, the plenary subsequently adopted, over opposition by the United States and others, a resolution that strengthened support for an ITU pension guarantee fund in the event studies of the UN Common System did not remedy what the staff perceived as inequities in the pension system.

Also of concern to the United States were attempts to modify portions of the agreements reached at the 1988 World Administrative Telephone and Telegraph Conference in Melbourne. The United States succeeded in its efforts to defeat these proposals, which we considered detrimental to U.S. interests.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A major goal of the developing countries at the conference was to establish a new Bureau for Development of Telecommunications (BDT) as an independent organ of the ITU. This was a followup to the Nairobi Conference, which added technical assistance to developing countries as one of the purposes of the Union. Because an enhanced technical assistance role for the ITU had the overwhelming support of the developing countries, no one spoke against it. However, many countries, including the United States, raised questions about the organization, operations and financing of the proposed new Bureau. Because these and other questions were not addressed prior to the vote to create the BDT, the United States and 29 other countries abstained. Seventy-three countries voted in favor, with none voting against.

Once creation of the Bureau was approved, the U.S. Delegation took an active role in shaping its mandate, which is set forth in the constitution of the new basic instrument approved by the Conference. It includes, in addition to traditional technical cooperation and assistance activities, support for global and regional development conferences. Unlike administrative conferences, the development conferences will be for the purpose of information exchange only rather than production of recommendations and regulations.

A medium-term plan for technical cooperation and assistance will be developed by the Secretary General and submitted to the 1991 Administrative Council. This will have a major influence on the Bureau's future efforts. In related action, the conference approved strengthening the ITU regional presence for technical cooperation and assistance activities, as recommended in a February 1989 report by an ITU-commissioned Group of Experts on "The Changing Telecommunication Environment."

The mandate of the Center for Telecommunications Development (CTD) as a separate entity funded by voluntary government and private sector donations was extended for 2 years. The Administrative Council was instructed to determine the CTD's future status at the 1991 Council session, maintaining the CTD as a separate entity and giving it additional time to prove itself was supported by the United States.

FUTURE CONFERENCES

The Plenipotentiary Conference approved the convening of a number of world and regional conferences over the next 5 years to revise parts of the radio regulations. Decisions on the schedule of these future conferences were in accord with U.S. positions. The approved conferences included a Second Session African Regional VHF/UHF Planning Conference and an African Regional Conference to abrogate the previous regional broadcasting area agreement, both held in December 1989; a Limited Allocation World Administrative Radio Conference in 1992; a High-Frequency-Broadcasting World Administrative Radio Conference in 1993; and a Regional Administrative Radio Conference on Criteria for Shared Use VHF and UHF Mobile, Broadcasting and Fixed Services for Region 3 (Eastern Europe) and possibly Region 1 (Americas), with details to be decided by the Administrative Council.

Japan's offer to host the next regular Plenipotentiary Conference in 1994 was accepted. The convening of an additional Plenipotentiary Conference before 1994, if deemed necessary by the 1991 Administrative Council to consider the recommendations of the HLC, was also approved.

ELECTIONS

Pekka Tarjanne, Director General of Telecommunications of Finland, won election as Secretary General, defeating Francisco Molina-Negro of Spain, 74 (U.S.) to 54. Jean Jipguep of Cameroon was reelected Deputy Secretary General without opposition. By a vote of 42 to 29 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions, the Administrative Council was enlarged from 41 to 43 members, with one additional seat each for the African and Asian regional groups. The Council acts as the Union's governing body between Plenipotentiary Conferences. The United States won reelection to the Council, but the United Kingdom lost, the first time a major donor lost representation on the Council. The trend toward a reduction of the total contributory units represented on the Council continued as smaller contributors replaced larger ones.

The Conference set a two-term limitation on the directors of the CCIs and the members of the IFRB. Some members raised the question of U.S. citizen Richard Kirby's eligibility for reelection as Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR). However, the ITU legal advisor's interpretation of the relevant provisions of the 1982 Nairobi Convention eliminated grounds for such a challenge. Mr. Kirby defeated the opposing Yugoslav candidate by a vote of 72 (U.S.) to 63. Theodor Irmer of the Federal Republic of Germany was reelected as Director of the International Telephone and Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCITT). Five members of the IFRB were also elected or reelected. All elected officials will serve until the next regularly scheduled Plenipotentiary Conference in 1994 if no extraordinary Plenipotentiary Conference is held earlier. If a Plenipotentiary Conference is convened before 1994 to consider recommendations of the HLC study, it may hold any elections it considers required to implement structural changes it decides upon, if any. This could possibly affect the tenure of the CCI Directors and/or IFRB members. The director of the BDT will be elected at the next Plenipotentiary Conference; at Nice, the Secretary General was designated to serve as interim director until that election.

FINAL ACTS

A primary purpose of the conference was to draft a permanent basic instrument for the ITU. Traditionally, the ITU has had no permanent constitution. Each convention was in force only until the next Plenipotentiary Conference. The 1989 Conference agreed to divide the basic instrument into a constitution and a convention, with modifications to be made through amendment processes less stringent for the convention. The new constitution and convention will take effect 30 days after ratification by the 55th member state. Senate advice and consent will be required for U.S. ratification.

In the U.S. Delegation's view, the new instruments are generally well-considered documents which should simplify the work of future Plenipotentiary Conferences. However, in signing the final acts, the United States took several reservations. We reserved the right to consider specific amendments to the basic instrument on an individual basis even if contained in a single protocol. We also filed appropriate reservations that would preserve the U.S. position on the status of administrative regulations, ensure continuation of the U.S. practice of demonstrating acceptance of administrative regulations only by ratification of the relevant instruments, and maintain the right to submit new reservations at the time of ratification. The United States did not sign an optional protocol on compulsory arbitration of disputes.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL, 45TH SESSION

Opening Session

The opening session of the 45th Administrative Council met immediately following the Nice Plenipotentiary Conference. Although the conference had approved a ceiling of 115 million Swiss francs for the 1990 expenditure budget, the Secretariat presented the council with a total expenditure budget of 118,100,000 Swiss francs. The council approved the higher figure after the Secretariat argued that the additional SFR 3,100,000 was necessary as a set-aside for the reserve fund required by the ITU financial regulations. The United States and 13 other members objected to this modification of the plenary agreement on an overall SFR 115 million ceiling.

The final 1990 budget of SFR 118,100,000 represented an adjusted real growth of 3.8 percent over the 1989 expenditure budget. This increase was attributable to a number of Plenipotentiary Conference decisions, among them the large commitment of resources to the new BDT, the increase in the number of working languages, and the absorption of UNDP shortfall costs by the regular budget. Hence, the value of a contributory unit rose from SFR 232,600 in 1989 to SFR 265,000 in 1990, an increase of 13.93 percent The U.S. contribution grew from SFR 6,978,000 in 1989 to SFR 7,950,000 in 1990 (approximately $5,315,196). In 1989 the United States was one of six major donors (the others were France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. and Japan) whose governments each contributed 30 units.

Extraordinary Session On High-Level Study Of The ITU

As instructed by the Plenipotentiary Conference, the 45th Administrative Council met in extraordinary session November 6 to 10 in Geneva to select a High-Level Committee (HLC) of 21 member state representatives to study the structure and functioning of the Union and to define procedures and general guidelines for the Committee on its activities.

The Council members adopted a list of work guidelines for the HLC, including specific tasks relating to the ITU standardization, regulatory and development assistance functions; the structure and functioning of the General Secretariat; conferences; and the interrelationships among the various organs of the ITU. Because of an inability to reach consensus on the priorities which should be assigned to these tasks, council members, including the United States, agreed to direct the HLC to give equal attention to all the tasks enumerated. After considerable debate, it was decided to choose the HLC members in a secret ballot (United States in favor), with due regard to equitable geographic balance. The United States and the other major donors in 1989 were all elected to the HLC.

The council decided that the first HLC meeting would be held in January 1990, with a target date of June 1991 for completion of the review. The United States and a number of other council members expressed concern that the June 1991 date did not provide sufficient time to conduct a careful and thorough review. The final resolution adopted on the HLC approved this timetable as a guide, but without precluding later change if deemed desirable by the HLC itself.

Subsequent to the council session, the U.S. Government designated Ambassador Gerald B. Helman, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and former U.S. Ambassador to the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva, as the U.S. member of the HLC.

CENTER FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

The Center for Telecommunications Development (CTD), created in response to the Report of the Independent Commission for Worldwide Telecommunication Development (1984), began operations in 1987. Its original purpose was to stimulate and accelerate the pace of development of telecommunications facilities and services in developing countries by providing advisory services on finance, policy direction and management operations at the pre-commercial or pre-investment stage of project development.

For several reasons, however, the CTD's activities were focused initially on longer-term projects analogous to those implemented by the Technical Cooperation Department (TCD) of the ITU General Secretariat, which emphasized network design, master plans and infrastructure rather than economic or managerial objectives. This gave rise to concerns about duplication of efforts. In addition, the new BDT, which will subsume the functions of the TCD, has a broad mandate which covers the mission of the center.

In view of these concerns, the CTD's Advisory Board reviewed the center's current operations and supported a shift in emphasis to specific, short-term projects more in line with the Center's original mission. The General Secretariat invited over 130 telecommunications administrations in developing countries to submit requests for such projects. Through the third quarter of 1989, the CTD had received 88 requests for projects, a 54 percent increase over the previous year. Projects were either being prepared, being implemented, or had been completed in 54 cases. The African region accounted for the largest number of projects, 40 out of the total of 88.

Funding for the center, in cash and in kind, is provided by voluntary donations from governments, institutions and private industry. The Department of State contributed $200,000 in October 1989, to be used to support specified field activities. Several U.S. telecommunications companies, through the U.S. Foundation for World Communications Development, contributed a total of $51,500 to the center in 1989. Eighteen countries made donations with a total worth of approximately $2 million in 1989. Despite these contributions, the Center has continued to encounter serious difficulties in attracting an adequate and dependable level of voluntary funding. This problem is still being addressed by a fund-raising working group formed in 1987.

ITU TECHNICAL BODIES

International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee

The International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT) began its new 4-year plenary period with numerous study group meetings held throughout the year. The technical, operational and tariff standards developed and promulgated by the CCITT for international telecommunications carriers, manufacturers and users are voluntarily implemented worldwide. The U.S. telecommunications industry and numerous U.S. Government departments and agencies participate actively in CCITT technical meetings and preparatory activities and contribute to defraying meeting costs in accordance with ITU budget and financial regulations. Private sector organizations directly contribute over $1 million annually to the ITU.

New procedures to accelerate adoption of new standards for telecommunications equipment and networks were first implemented at a September meeting of Study Group XVII. Progress also was made in implementing U.S. recommendations adopted by the 1988 Plenary Assembly to reorganize the CCITT's component committees on a more functional basis in order to eliminate redundancies and reduce the required number of meetings. A committee formed to further improve organization and working methods was scheduled to hold its first meeting in February 1990.

The developing countries continued to press for a change in the current 50-50 split of international telecommunications services revenue, arguing that additional funds would enable them to undertake greater telecommunications development. The CCITT and the General Secretariat continued to study the question.

Other issues considered within the CCITT included principles governing use of private leased lines; use of personal computers in network operation; the Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN), including the standards for a broad band network; the convergence of information and telecommunications technologies; an international telecommunications credit card; and new standards for higher speed facsimile services.

International Radio Consultative Committee

The International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) carries out studies and develops international recommendations and specifications in the field of radio communications. These voluntary recommendations and specifications are generally observed by the telecommunications industry worldwide. Recognized private operating agencies, as well as scientific and industrial entities of the private sector, participate in the activities of the CCIR and contribute to the cost of meetings. The U.S. National CCIR Organization, a long-standing federal advisory committee with over 300 members drawn from the private sector and the federal government, provides advice to the Department of State for U.S. participation in the CCIR. Government, industry, academic and other representatives attend the various CCIR study group meetings in Geneva.

The CCIR had an active program of meetings during 1989. In addition to many smaller working parties which met to deal with specific topics, the 13 full study groups held their final meetings in Geneva during the period September through November. The major accomplishments included progress toward a high-definition television studio production and international program exchange standard; recommendations on technical, operational and procedural guidelines to facilitate satellite news-gathering on a global basis; a report on digital cellular radio covering the major systems under development in North America, Europe and Japan; and an expanded report on mobile satellite system characteristics, covering all services with an emphasis on common requirements, interoperability, and efficient use and sharing of the frequency spectrum. This work will be reviewed at the CCIR's quadrennial Plenary Assembly in May 1990.

International Frequency Registration Board

The major function of the International Frequency Radio Board (IFRB) is to ensure the orderly recording of radio frequencies and satellite orbital positions which national administrations assign to their radio stations, including satellite systems. The board also assists countries and administrative radio conferences in all matters related to radio spectrum management.

Further progress was made in 1989 on extended use of the ITU computer and implementation of a new computerized system for spectrum management. The board also was active in preparing for the 1993 High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference.

Universal Postal Union (UPU)

Western Samoa became a member of the Universal Postal Union (UPU) during 1989, bringing the Union's total membership to 170. The United States has been a member of the UPU since its founding (as the General Postal Union) in 1874.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council, the administrative body of the UPU which meets annually, met in Bern, Switzerland, from April 6–28. The Council reviewed its 1985–1989 activities in preparation for the 20th UPU Congress; heard a report from the U.S. Delegation, as Congress hosts, on logistical preparations for the quinquennial meeting; designated China, France, the U.S.S.R. and Zambia as vice chairmen of the Congress; and agreed that the Congress would have 10 working committees, as did the 19th Congress, held in 1984 in Hamburg.

The Executive Council adopted a calendar year 1990 budget calling for contributions from member countries totaling 24,389,500 Swiss francs. The U.S. Delegation disassociated itself from the budget decision, maintaining that the budget increases represented more than zero real growth. The United States was assessed 1,245,000 Swiss francs, or some 5.1 percent of the total 1990 assessments.

CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL FOR POSTAL STUDIES

The United States is a member of the Consultative Council for Postal Studies (CCPS). The CCPS conducts studies in operational, economic and technical areas, focusing on improving postal services worldwide in the 5-year period between congresses. The CCPS customarily holds its annual meeting in Bern in the autumn but, because of the timing of the 20th UPU Congress, did not meet in 1989.

TWENTIETH CONGRESS OF THE UPU

The United States was host to the 20th UPU Congress which took place in Washington, D.C., from November 13 to December 14, and as host was chairman of the Congress. More than 1,000 delegates representing 159 countries and various observer organizations attended the Congress. Administrative costs were financed by the sale of commemorative postal materials at the World Stamp Expo '89, which was held during the Congress and attended by some 125,000 individuals.

President Bush delivered the Congress's inaugural address during ceremonies at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Postmaster General Anthony M. Frank served as both Honorary President of the Congress and honorary head of the U.S. Delegation. Edward E. Horgan, Jr., U.S. Associate Postmaster General, served as Congress President, and Deputy Postmaster General Michael S. Coughlin was the head of the U.S. Delegation.

Among the significant actions of the Congress were decisions to improve the management of the work of the UPU; to transfer from the Congress to the Executive Council powers allowing for more rapid decision-making in the regulations governing international postal services; to approve a new, more cost-related structure for terminal dues (the amounts countries pay each other for imbalances in mail delivery); and to introduce some flexibility for updating rates during the 5-year span between congresses.

The Congress adopted 1991–1995 annual budget ceilings representing 4 to 6 percent real growth per year. The U.S. Delegation argued for zero real growth in deliberations in the Second Committee (Finance) and during the Congress plenary, and disassociated itself from the plenary consensus decision on the 1991–1995 ceilings.

The United States, by virtue of its hosting of the 20th UPU Congress, will chair the Executive Council in the period 1990–1994. The Congress accepted the nomination of Assistant Postmaster General Thomas E. Leavey as Chairman of the Executive Council until the 21st Congress. The United States was also reelected to the CCPS by the Congress for the same period.*

The Congress reelected by acclamation UPU Director General Adwaldo C. Botto de Barros (Brazil), and elected Jaime Ascandoni (Spain) as the new Deputy Director General. Both will serve 5-year terms of office expiring December 31, 1994.

The Congress also unanimously accepted the invitation of the Republic of Korea to host the 21st Congress of the UPU, which will be held in Seoul in late 1994.

International Labor Organization (ILO)

The International Labor Organization, whose headquarters is in Geneva, has 150 members, each represented by government, worker and employer delegations. In 1989, as usual, the Governing Body, which has 28 government, 14 worker, and 14 employer delegates, met in Geneva three times. The annual International Labor Conference, the organization's general assembly, in which all member states are represented by two government delegates, one workers' delegate and one employers' delegate, was held in June also in Geneva.

GOVERNING BODY

Financial Issues

As the executive organ of the International Labor Organization, the governing body deals with administrative, program and budget issues. After 5 days of deliberation at the February–March session, the Program, Financial and Administrative Committee approved by consensus a 1990–1991 biennium provisional program and budget of $349,879,000, calculated at an exchange rate of 1.60 Swiss francs per U.S. dollar. The Governing Body plenary gave its formal approval March 2. For the first time in memory, discussions were devoid of rancor and focused almost exclusively on technical activities.

---

* The 20th UPU Congress elected the following to 1990–1994 terms:

Executive Council: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ethiopia, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States (Chairman), Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

CCPS: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States and U.S.S.R.

Informed observers attributed the success to ILO acceptance of the new system, recommended by the United States, to establish broad agreement on budget levels the year before the actual program and budget discussion. The United States also urged the ILO to continue to review and set priorities so that future consideration of programs and budgets could also begin with a broad measure of general support and an agreement on estimated levels.

As anticipated, the adjustments to the program and budget proposed by the Director-General following the committee discussions were minor—totaling less than $500,000. Further, within the adjustments, the ILO took into account a U.S. recommendation to reduce the number of technical meetings and redistribute resources to increase technical activities, including child labor safety and health risks, rural structural adjustment, and work on reforming labor legislation in Namibia in preparation for eventual independence. The total additions were $471,972 and total reductions were $470,844, resulting in a net addition of $1,238.

The United States gave strong support to administrative reforms and welcomed internal transfer of resources to technical activites. In the technical field, the United States singled out the major program in international labor standards and human rights as the core activity of the ILO and led support for it. We opposed, however, the newly merged equality of rights program, which contains a provision for an apartheid monitoring group.

Election of Director General

On February 13 the Governing Body formally elected Michel Hansenne of Belguim as Director General to succeed Francis Blanchard of France who had held the position for 15 years. Hansenne, whose 5-year term began February 27, was previously Minister of Civil Service in the Belgian Cabinet. The new Director General received 38 votes (U.S.), with 18 delegates not voting.

ILO ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 76th International Labor Conference was held at Geneva June 7–28. More than 1,750 government, employer and worker delegates as well as advisors participated. The United States succeeded in its major objectives.

— For the second successive year an unacceptable Arab resolution on the situation of workers and employers in the Israeli occupied territories was bottled up in the resolutions committee (as was an unacceptable resolution on foreign debt).

— The Organization's important human and worker rights supervisory machinery produced a credible report, highlighting deficiencies in Turkey, Romania, the Central African Republic, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic and Colombia. Iran and Nicaragua were omitted, however, from special censure.

— Secretary of Labor Dole's ILO debut was highly successful and her plenary address well received.

— Despite unsatisfactory elements in the Apartheid Committee's report, we were able to join a consensus in adopting its conclusions, whereas, in previous years, we have had to call for votes in committee to register our disapproval.

— The Conference adopted by consensus a zero growth budget for the 1990–1991 biennium.

— The Conference completed a satisfactory revision of Convention 107 on indigenous populations.

— Six members of Poland's Solidarity Trade Union were included in the Polish delegation, marking the organization's first appearance as part of the Polish workers delegation since 1981, when Lech Walesa was the workers' representative.

— The Conference plenary was relatively free of the excessive anti-U.S. rhetoric that has marked other years. Expected criticism from Nicaragua, Panama and Iran did not materialize.

Secretary of Labor Elizabeth H. Dole attended the Conference June 22 and 23. In her extremely well received plenary address, the Secretary praised the ILO's commitment to human rights and stressed that the organization's moral force results from "strict adherence" to its founding principles and its continued impartial role in supervising the application of international labor standards. In a review of domestic economic developments, the Secretary noted the strength of the U.S. economy (and its creation of over 20 million new jobs since 1981) but also referred to the "troubling national deficit." She said a major factor in our success was labor and capital market flexibility.

The Secretary also stated that growth was not the only goal of U.S. policy. She explained that she has initiated a policy of "growth plus," which was aimed at helping minorities and immigrants, the disadvantaged and the disabled acquire the education and training necessary for employment. The Secretary noted that a global growth plus strategy—which would mean investing in growth, the work force and the protection of workers—had possible applications for countries and organizations striving to cope with the complex problems of structural adjustment. In this regard, the Secretary welcomed the ILO's efforts to ensure that labor and social aspects of structural adjustment are taken fully into account.

The Secretary concluded by announcing that the Department of Labor would be funding three new ILO projects. One study will deal with drug and alcohol abuse in the workplace. Secretary Dole announced that, in addition, Labor intended to host an international symposium in Washington to discuss the study's results and to promote national and international action to deal with the problem.

The U.S. Government Delegation was chaired by Ambassador Shellyn McCaffrey, Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. James Mattson, Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary and Coordinator for International Labor Affairs, Department of State, served as the other government delegate. Ambassador Joseph Petrone, U.S. Permanent Representative, Geneva, and Dr. David Peterson, U.S. Department of Commerce, were alternate delegates. Mr. Brian Glade, Director for International Labor Affairs, U.S. Council for International Business (acting for Mr. Charles H. Smith, Jr., Chairman of the Board, SIFCO Industries, Inc.) and Mr. James Baker, European Representative, AFL-CIO, headed the U.S. employer and worker delegations, respectively.

Former ILO Director General Francis Blanchard was honored in a special program on June 15 for his service to the ILO.

Noting that the ILO was celebrating its 70th anniversary, President Jean-Pascal Delamuraz of Switzerland praised the accomplishments of the tripartite organization, crediting it with putting the social dimension of human existence on the agenda of political life nationally and internationally.

Financial Issues

Financial questions before the ILC included two major issues: adoption of the ILO's proposed new long-term strategy on exchange rates and the 1990–1991 program and budget. Despite a few allusions to the U.S. Government arrears and several pointed pleas for punctual payment of assessed contributions by the "major contributors," ILC consideration of all financial issues in 1989 proceeded with exceptional harmony and dispatch. In fact, the mandatory plenary record vote on the resolution concerning the adoption of the 1990–1991 program and budget and allocation of expenses among member states saw an unprecedented 394 delegates vote for its adoption, 3 against, with no abstentions. At the June 13 market rate of 1.75 Swiss francs per U.S. dollar, the biennial budget would be Swiss francs 578,270,000, or U.S. $330,440,000 and would remain in real terms at the same level as the previous biennium. At the 1.75 rate, U.S. assessed contributions to the ILO for 1990–1991 would total U.S. $82,610,000. In the Finance Committee's discussion of the proposed 1990–1991 program and budget, a number of other governments also welcomed the zero real growth level of the budget.

On June 13, to capitalize on the weakening Swiss franc/U.S. dollar exchange rate, the Committee approved the Office's request to "forward purchase" U.S. dollars immediately at the market rate, not to exceed 1.77 Swiss francs per dollar. The resulting forward exchange contracts produced 1990–1991 biennial budget levels that eventually were adopted by the Conference. This was expected to yield as well a gross premium of some 6 1/2 million Swiss francs.

Technical Committees

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. The Conference revised the 1957 version of this convention. The United States supported the redraft, which updates the original convention's integrationist approach so as to reflect respect for the cultures, traditions and unique circumstances of indigenous peoples. One of the main issues was the proposed substitution of the word "people" for "populations." The question of land rights was another salient issue.

The final vote—328 (U.S.) for and one against—was significant for the number of abstentions (49), just over one-half of which came from Latin America, where there was a great deal of concern about the provisions dealing with land rights and national resources.

Night Work. The Committee held the first discussion of a proposed protocol that would (1) set new standards applying to all employed persons regardless of sex and (2) partially revise Convention 89 on night work for women in industry. Taking a position between the workers' view that night work was detrimental to health and disturbing to workers' social and family life and the employers' view that this contention did not hold true in all cases, the committee recognized that night work was indispensable in some cases but that specific measures should be taken to reduce its drawbacks, eliminate its hazards and properly compensate employees.

Use of Chemicals. A convention and recommendation will be proposed in 1990 concerning the use of chemicals at work. The main objective will be to reduce the incidence of chemically induced illnesses and injuries by ensuring that chemicals are evaluated to determine their potential hazards and that employers and workers are provided with the information. The Conference adopted a resolution asking the ILO to cooperate with other organizations in harmonizing national and regional criteria and classifications that protect workers using chemicals.

Committee on the Application of Standards

Out of the 50 cases the Committee examined, six countries were singled out for deficiencies in meeting their obligations.

The Central African Republic was cited under the Freedom of Association Convention for the imposition of a single trade union structure.

Colombia was also cited under the Freedom of Association Convention. Noting "grave divergencies" with the provisions of the convention and recalling the concern expressed earlier by the Governing Body's Committee on Freedom of Association following the September 1988 direct contact mission, the Committee called on Colombia to "reintroduce a situation propitious to the reestablishment of civil liberties" and to "guarantee the physical safety of trade unionists."

The Dominican Republic was cited under Conventions 95 (protection of wages) and 105 (abolition of forced labor). Expressing continuing concern with the situation of Haitian cane cutters in the country, the Committee stressed that there had been no progress on essential points raised over a number of years and considered that, as from the next harvest, further efforts were called for to verify the situation.

Ecuador was asked to show proof of progress within the year on amendments to be introduced to its labor code that would bring its legislation into conformity with the Freedom of Association Convention. Also cited under Convention 105 (forced labor), Ecuador was asked to revise its law and practice regarding prison sentences (including compulsory forced labor) for fomenting or taking a leading part in a collective work stoppage.

Romania was cited under Convention 111 on discrimination in employment. The committee took note of persistent "serious divergences" between the convention and Romania's law and practice, especially with regard to the convention's prohibition of discrimination in employment based on political opinion and social origin. It asked the Romanian Government to accept a study mission, but this was categorically rejected.

Turkey, the subject of long-standing freedom of association complaints, was also cited under Convention 111 for discrimination in employment based on political opinion.

Resolutions Committee

As in 1988, the dominating political issue in the 1989 Conference was another unacceptable Arab resolution against Israel. In the end, however, it never came up, because in a secret ballot to determine the order in which the resolutions would be considered, two other resolutions were given higher priority. Time ran out before the third-ranked Arab draft could be acted upon. In fact, time ran out before action on any resolutions could be completed, including a resolution on the environment the United States had hoped to see pass.

Credentials Committee

Acting on fewer challenges than it received in 1988, the Credentials Committee did not recommend that the conference uphold any of the objections. In addition to U.S. and Pakistani reservations about the legitimacy of the Kabul regime, there were four significant challenges.

As was case in 1988, the employers' group objected to Nicaragua's designation of the Union Nacional De Agricultores Y Ganaderos as the Nicaragua employer delegate, noting that its selection had been made without the agreement of the Consejo Superior De Empresa Privada. The Committee concluded that the employer delegation should have been nominated in agreement with the latter, which was "undoubtedly the most representative" employer organization.

Several unions—all members of the Congreso Permanente de los Trabajadores—challenged the Nicaraguan workers' delegate, claiming that the Congreso, as the most representative labor organization, should have been consulted. The Credentials Committee concluded that the Congreso claims had not been supported by credible data.

The Moroccan workers' delegate was challenged by unions who charged that the Moroccan Government did not consult with them or abide by a rotation scheme. The Committee concluded that the government's decision "could not be questioned."

Committee On Action Against Apartheid

After more than a week of debate that was reasonably free of rancor and vituperation, the Apartheid Committee and the plenary adopted eight major conclusions by consensus. These ranged from complaints about members' failure to implement fully the ILO declaration and program of action to calls for disinvestment and the fullest possible implementation of Security Council resolution 435 on Namibia.

The United States noted, both in committee and in a plenary statement, our concerns and reservations about sanctions, disinvestment and severing diplomatic relations, but it was possible to avoid calling for a vote in the committee.

Other Issues

Iran and the Arabs defeated a routine bid by the Baha'is international community for observer status. The Baha'is, a respected observer in a number of other UN agencies, were particularly interested in the Applications Committee, where for a number of years Iran has faced harsh criticism for discrimination against its Baha'is population. In an emotional debate, filled with charges reminiscent of other eras, the Baha'is were described as a "heretical movement," a "barbarous sect," a political movement "opposed to religion" and "linked to the Zionist enemy." Only the United States, Canada, France and the United Kingdom publicly defended the Baha'is request for observer status, which was defeated by a vote of 152 (U.S.) for, 30 against, with 207 abstentions. Since a quorum of 256 present and voting was necessary, the motion to seat failed. In an explanation of its vote, the United States said that the result was "a day of shame which (the U.S.) Government shall not soon forget."

U.S. ACTION ON ILO CONVENTIONS

On January 3 President Bush transmitted to the Senate for ratification ILO Convention 160 Concerning Labor Statistics. On November 1 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the convention at which Labor Secretary Dole, Commissioner Janet Norwood of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Solicitor Robert P. Davis and Anthony G. Freeman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Labor Affairs, testified. Convention 160 was favorably reported out of Committee and scheduled for full Senate vote early in 1990.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations, formally established in March, 1951, as a successor to the International Meteorological Organization—a nongovernmental organization founded in 1873. WMO is responsible for promoting international cooperation in the collection, analysis and exchange of meteorological information, and in the application of meteorology to such areas as aviation, shipping, agriculture and water resource management. Through its major programs on weather, climate and water resources, the WMO serves vital U.S. strategic and commercial interests, as well as a wide variety of human needs which depend upon timely and accurate exchange of meteorological information. In 1989 there were 161 members of the WMO, including 156 states and 5 territories.

ORGANIZATION

The executive head is Secretary General G.O.P. Obasi from Nigeria, now in his second 4-year term, which expires in December 1991.

The supreme body of the WMO is the Congress, which consists of all members of the organization. It meets every 4 years to review WMO program activities, to establish general policies and budgetary requirements for the next 4-year period, and to conduct elections for officers of the organization and members of the Executive Council. The 10th Congress met in 1987.

The Executive Council is a subsidiary body of the Congress which meets at least once a year to supervise the implementation of the programs that the WMO Congress has approved. The Executive Council is composed of 36 directors of national meteorological or hydrometeorological services who serve on the Council in their personal capacity for a 4-year term. Dr. Elbert (Joe) Friday, the Director of the National Weather Service, is the U.S. Permanent Representative to the WMO, and a member of the Executive Council. The 41st session of the Executive Council was held in June 1989.

MAJOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

World Weather Watch

The World Weather Watch (WWW) is the basic and highest priority program of the WMO, facilitating the collection, processing and free exchange of meteorological data among its members. Its essential program elements include the Global Observing System (GOS), the Global Data-Processing System (GDPS) and the Global Telecommunication System (GTS).

The 41st Executive Council focused on the further development of the WWW system. Members were pleased with actions taken to make meteorological communications arrangements available for emergency notifications following nuclear and other environmentally significant accidents, and decided that WMO should participate actively in the UN designated International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) in the 1990's. The Executive Council strongly endorsed the expansion of the Tropical Cyclone Program and praised the contribution of regional cooperation in its success. The council also requested its Panel of Experts on Satellites to develop a comprehensive statement on the role of satellites in meteorological, hydrological and climate programs.

World Climate Program

The objective of the World Climate Program is to assist members in developing capabilities for monitoring and forecasting climate changes, and, when possible, to help mitigate any adverse effects. In considering the report of the 10th session of the Commission for Climatology, the 41st Executive Council endorsed the Commission's proposal that WMO initiate a Climate Change Detection Project in collaboration with other agencies and with the Commission as a leading body within WMO.

The Executive Council adopted the following statement setting forth WMO's responsibilites as the UN's authoritative voice on climate change and the atmospheric environment: "WMO's responsibility is to provide the authoritative scientific information and advice on the condition and behavior of the global atmosphere and climate and the conditions that affect them."

The Executive Council announced that major themes for the 1990 Second World Climate Conference (SWCC), which will be held in Geneva in coordination with the UN Environment Program (UNEP) and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), will be the World Climate Program and the issue of climate change.

To promote the expansion of global climatological data collection and analysis, especially in developing countries, the 41st Executive Council established the Special Fund for Climate and Atmospheric Environment Studies. With a goal of $22 million in contributions, this 2-year climate studies fund would expand worldwide capabilities for and contributions to global climatological research. This initial effort would boost international activity to a higher level, subsequently to be sustained by regular WMO programs and related support for climatology and meteorology.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established by the 40th WMO Executive Council and the 14th regular session of the UNEP Governing Council as an international working body mandated to assess scientific information on climate change and its impacts, and consider response strategy options to the threat of global climate change. Three working groups were formed to coordinate assessments of scientific information, impacts, and response strategies, and are chaired by the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. and United States, respectively.

The 41st Executive Council strongly supported the work of the IPCC and endorsed the decisions taken by the IPCC to augment the participation level of scientists and officials from developing nations.

Applications of Meteorology

The 41st Council applauded the work of the Commission on Agricultural Meteorology, particularly with regard to its active role in providing publications and training seminars. Efforts to combat desertification, in cooperation with UNEP and other organizations, also received high praise, as did the Secretary General's swift response to requests for assistance in the fight against desert locusts in northern Africa.

Hydrology and Water Resources Program

Many regions of the world face serious water problems, ranging from drought to major flooding. These problems have reinforced the need for efficient assessment, development and management of water resources. In order to respond to this need, the Hydrology and Water Resources Program (HWR) was established to ensure the assessment and forecasting of the quantity and quality of water resources. The HWR promotes worldwide cooperation in the evaluation and development of water resources through the coordinated establishment of hydrological networks and services, including data collection and processing, hydrological forecasting and warning, and the supplying of meteorological and hydrological data for planning purposes.

The Commission on Hydrology dealt with several issues that are worsening globally: the discharge of toxic wastes into and the pollution of both surface and groundwater; the adverse impacts of burgeoning urban populations on hydrology resources; and the need for monitoring climate change through its effects on hydrology systems.

Research and Development

Within the WMO Research and Development Program, the organization seeks to promote a better understanding of the atmospheric environment and its processes, with the Commission for Atmospheric Sciences (CAS) having the lead role within the WMO for promoting and coordinating members' research efforts. The R & D Program took on a new look under the leadership of J. LaBrousse, France, the first Westerner to head the program in 25 years. As a result, the United States and other Western countries were prepared to support R & D activities more fully than in the past.

The 41st Executive Council accepted a report of its Panel on Environmental Pollution and Atmospheric Chemistry that proposed specific measures for more comprehensive archiving and an expanded program to integrate activities of several existing and planned networks, to be called the "Global Atmosphere Watch." The Council emphasized priority for a more complete definition of this program, which would be implemented in close collaboration with UNEP.

Technical Cooperation

WMO technical cooperation activities assist member states in the development and maintenance of national meteorological capabilities. The 41st Executive Council was pleased with the information that 133 countries had received technical assistance valued at $23.7 million in 1988. This assistance was expected to exceed $30 million in 1989 and was received through the UN Development Program (UNDP), the WMO Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP), trust funds and the WMO regular budget.

COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A debate arose in the WMO over UN General Assembly resolution 43/177 that designates "Palestine" be used in place of the title "Palestine Liberation Organization" in the UN system. The Council agreed that the Secretary General should follow the practice adopted by other organizations in the UN system. The PLO did not seek membership for "Palestine" in the WMO as it did, unsuccessfully, in some other UN system agencies.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

The 41st Executive Council approved accounts for the ninth financial period (1984–1987), which closed in deficit due to unpaid and delayed payments. The

Council also approved an extension of the contract with the external auditor until 1993.

The Council took account of the Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) recommendations, requesting the Secretary General to study and report to FAC and the 42nd Executive Council on the status of contribution arrearages, financial constraints and ways of augmenting budget resources, and additional measures needed to correct the shortfall in UNDP support cost moneys.

Voluntary Cooperation Program

The WMO established the Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP) in 1967 at U.S. initiative. The VCP provides equipment and training to developing countries to assist them in participating in the WMO World Weather Watch and other programs. The global participation thus fostered enables all WMO members to gain access to a wide range of meteorological data. Without the VCP, many developing states would be unable to install costly weather monitoring equipment, so that valuable meteorological data (currently used by the United States to support civil aviation, shipping, military activities and storm detection/warning) would be unavailable.

Members make contributions to the VCP in cash payments to the Voluntary Cooperation Fund or as in-kind assistance in the form of equipment, expert services, training and long-term fellowships. In-kind contributions in 1989 represented 96.6 percent of the overall VCP budget, and totaled approximately $7.94 million, while cash contributions amounted to $281,840. The U.S. share included $100,000 in cash and $1.86 million provided as in-kind assistance in response to specific requests from developing nations.

INTERNAL MATTERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The 41st Executive Council continued to study ways of increasing the efficiency of its sessions. Concern was voiced about unrestricted, lengthy and repeated interventions by several members, and the inclusion of too much national information incorporated in the annual report. Some members felt there were too many subcommittees. Others called for documents to be more concise and generally limited to matters requiring opinions and decisions of the Council. The Secretary General was requested to use a new documentation model for the next Council meeting.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

In his first address to Congress on February 9, 1989, President Bush underscored the seriousness with which the United States views the prospect of nuclear weapons proliferation, and the central role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to U.S. efforts aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. In this framework, the President pledged to "strengthen the hand of the International Atomic Energy Agency," and stated that "our diplomacy must work every day against the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

The President's commitment to support the vital work of the IAEA was further highlighted in his statement to the 34th session of the IAEA General Conference, in which he said:

> The IAEA continues to be one of the most important institutional barriers to nuclear weapons proliferation . . . as such, it plays a notable role in preserving global peace and security through its safeguards function and through its promotion of the peaceful applications of nuclear energy.

In undertaking its statutory obligations both to prevent the use of nuclear energy for military purposes and to promote the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy, the IAEA fulfills a unique role within the UN system in regard to critical U.S.—as well as global—security interests. Since its establishment in 1957, the IAEA has assumed even greater importance as more complex nuclear facilities have come into operation and as the total quantity of fissionable material has steadily increased. In addition, with more than 430 operational nuclear power reactors worldwide by the end of 1989, and close to 100 more under construction, the IAEA's activities in support of nuclear safety and waste management have made an increasingly valuable contribution to global efforts to harness needed energy resources.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

The IAEA was created, largely at U.S. initiative, in response to growing concerns that nuclear materials or technology devoted to peaceful applications could potentially be diverted to military purposes. Under its statute, the IAEA is entrusted with the dual responsibility to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world . . ." and "ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose."

The IAEA's "promotional" role with respect to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is accomplished through activities under its programs of technical assistance, nuclear energy and safety, and research and isotopes. The Agency's "deterrent" role is undertaken primarily through the application of international safeguards.

The IAEA Secretariat (composed of approximately 1,750 staff members) is responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the Agency's major programs. Headquartered in Vienna, Austria, the Agency's staff is currently headed by Director General Hans Blix (Sweden), who was reappointed in 1989 to a third 4-year term of office.

The IAEA General Conference, which is open to participation by all 113 members, provides general oversight of the Agency's work, including final approval of the annual program and budget. Representatives on the 35-member IAEA Board of Governors offer overall direction and guidance with respect to the Secretariat's policies and implementation of program activities. In 1989 the Board met in February, June, September and December; the General Conference convened its annual week-long session in September.

IAEA PROGRAMS

Safeguards

The safeguards program is a unique system of international verification of national commitments—made in accordance with treaty and other obligations —regarding the peaceful use of nuclear energy. On-site inspections by the IAEA include audits of facility records, independent measurements to verify facility records and national reports, and use of instrumental surveillance and seals. Since the IAEA has no international "enforcement" capabilities, the safeguards system is designed primarily to deter, through threat of timely detection, the diversion of nuclear material from peaceful to nonpeaceful purposes. If diversion of nuclear material is suspected by the IAEA, it can report its findings to the Board of Governors and ultimately to the United Nations. However, it is the responsibility of member states to respond appropriately through bilateral and multilateral mechanisms. Under the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) all non-nuclear-weapon state parties are required to negotiate a comprehensive, or "full-scope," safeguards agreement with the IAEA covering all nuclear facilities and source or special fissionable materials in all peaceful nuclear activities under their control.

During 1989 the IAEA performed approximately 2,200 on-site inspections at 525 facilities in 58 member states with the assistance of over 200 IAEA inspectors, utilizing sophisticated equipment for nuclear material verification and surveillance. IAEA staff and senior management continued to express concerns, in 1989, regarding the need for additional resources required to safeguard adequately new nuclear facilities which are expected to come on-line by the mid-1990's, including several complex reprocessing and bulk handling facilities. Various alternatives for meeting increased safeguards resource needs remained under informal discussion among member states and IAEA staff, including greater use of voluntary contributions, proposals for improving efficiencies, as well as overall budgetary increases funded through assessed contributions by member states.

As part of the Agency's efforts to realize further efficiencies in the safeguards program, the Director General announced, at the 1989 February Board of Governors' meeting, a number of modifications to the organization of the Safeguards

Department. In addition, improvements were initiated to ensure closer coordination between IAEA safeguards activities—conducted under the regular program and budget—and voluntary safeguards support programs administered by member states. In 1989, thirteen member states provided assistance to the Agency through such programs, which supported important research and development related to safeguards approaches. Traditionally, these support programs have permitted the IAEA to devote the majority of its limited resources to operational safeguards activities (i.e., inspection and verification). The United States remained the largest contributor of voluntary support to the IAEA safeguards program in 1989, making available approximately $6.7 million for research and development (conducted at U.S. facilities) and the provision of approximately 20 cost-free experts to the IAEA Safeguards Department. The year 1989 witnessed the culmination of efforts by the U.S. support program, over the past several years, to develop and test a new video surveillance system, which will eventually replace obsolescent film camera instruments in safeguarded nuclear facilities.

Also, in 1989, the IAEA Secretariat simplified and streamlined its annual Safeguards Implementation Report (SIR) for presentation to the Board of Governors. This effort was undertaken in response to appeals by members that the SIR document—which evaluates overall safeguards performance— provide information in a clearer and more comprehensible format so as to avoid misunderstanding, particularly among policy-makers and the public, regarding the overall credibility and effectiveness of the safeguards system. Consideration was also given to releasing the SIR, with accompanying explanatory documentation, to the public as a means of promoting greater transparency and public understanding of IAEA safeguards.

Safeguards agreements were concluded by the IAEA during 1989 with: Algeria (for supply of a research reactor and fuel by Argentina); Laos, Tunisia, Bhutan, and Antigua and Barbuda (for full-scope safeguards pursuant to NPT adherence); and India (for supply of nuclear material by France). In addition, the IAEA safeguards agreement with China, negotiated pursuant to the latter's voluntary offer to place nuclear facilities under safeguards, entered into force on September 18, 1989. IAEA efforts to negotiate a comprehensive NPT safeguards agreement with North Korea witnessed progress late in 1989, but remained stymied largely as a result of politically-motivated demands by North Korea to alter key provisions of the standard agreement.

Nuclear Energy and Safety

Following the Chernobyl nuclear accident in 1986, the IAEA launched an aggressive program aimed at strengthening its existing nuclear safety program. While short-term activities—focusing on the negotiation of Conventions for Emergency Assistance and Notification, as well as data collection and analysis in the immediate aftermath of the accident—were undertaken in 1986, specific longer-term initiatives were conducted under a special nuclear safety program in 1987–1988.

In 1989 the Agency sought to integrate these special safety enhancement activities into the framework of the regular program and budget. As part of this effort, the Agency continued to place emphasis on operational safety in its program activities, and specifically the work of Operational Safety Advisory Review Teams (OSART's) and Radiation Protection Advisory Teams (RAPAT's). Although regulatory policies ultimately remain the responsibility of national authorities, OSART and RAPAT Missions—which are dispatched to facilities at the request of member states—offer valuable assistance and advice to IAEA members in improving operational safety practices and adequate radiation protection procedures.

During 1989 the IAEA Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident entered into force for 11 nations, bringing the total number of parties to 43. The Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency also entered into force for 11 countries, increasing to 39 the total number of parties.

In February 1989 IAEA members were notified of a serious accident in El Salvador involving the exposure of three workers to a cobalt 60 radiation source at an industrial irradiation facility for the sterilizaton of medical products. Through the IAEA, the United States and others provided medical and radiation protection experts in response to the accident.

Under the general framework of the Agency's nuclear safety program, IAEA Director General Blix convened a group of experts in April/May 1989 to consider steps aimed at strengthening the Agency's guidelines for the physical protection of nuclear materials. This set of recommendations is designed to assist members in carrying out their sovereign responsibilities to guard against attempts to seize or attack nuclear facilities or materials under their jurisdiction or control. As a result of the recommendations of the experts' group, the Agency's document setting forth these guidelines (INFCIRC/225) was substantially revised and the new version was published in December.

Technical Assistance and Cooperation

The IAEA Technical Assistance and Cooperation program plays an integral role in fulfilling the Agency's responsibility for promoting the safe and peaceful uses of atomic energy throughout the world. Under this program, assistance is provided to over 80 developing states in the form of experts, training, and equipment in a broad range of subject areas including medicine, agriculture, energy development, nuclear safety, hydrology, industry and the physical sciences. Maintenance of a vital technical cooperation program remains a key part of efforts to encourage the adoption of responsible non-proliferation policies (including support for IAEA safeguards) and safety practices among developing states in the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Resources for the implementation of technical cooperation activities are provided through voluntary contributions from member states. In addition, the UN Development Program provides support to selected projects administered by the IAEA. In 1989 total contributions from member states to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund (TACF) amounted to approximately $34 million. Of this amount, the United States provided over $10.1 million as a voluntary cash contribution. In addition, the United States made a substantial "in-kind" contribution worth $1.5 million to support technical cooperation projects in developing countries which are party either to the NPT or the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). The United States also made available approximately $2.5 million to the IAEA for training courses, expert services and fellowships. A significant portion of these funds were used, as well, to provide assistance, through the IAEA, to NPT and/or Tlatelolco parties, on a preferential basis. Office automation equipment (valued at over $65,000) was also provided to the IAEA by the United States in order to assist in the management and implementation of the Agency's technical cooperation program.

At the February Board, IAEA Director General Blix announced steps to reorganize the Department of Technical Assistance and Cooperation by separating, into two divisions, responsibilities for programming and implementation. This decision was designed to facilitate improved utilization and management of growing technical assistance resources.

Research and Isotopes

During 1989 the Agency's Department of Research and Isotopes continued to explore—through in-house expertise and the supervision of coordinated research programs—various applications of nuclear energy to such diverse fields as nuclear medicine, environmental studies, chemistry, hydrology, nuclear, physics and agriculture. Much of this work was performed at laboratories located in Vienna, Seibersdorf (Austria), and—for studies related to radioactivity in the marine environment—at the Agency's laboratory in Monaco. In addition, the IAEA continued to operate jointly with the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) International Center for Theoretical Physics in Trieste, Italy, which promotes advanced research in physical and mathematical sciences primarily in developing countries.

Since 1987 the United States has made an annual contribution to the IAEA to support the construction of expanded and improved training facilities at the Seibersdorf Laboratory. With the final U.S. contribution of $150,000 in 1989 and other donations by member states, sufficient resources were available to the IAEA to begin phase one of the construction project, which is expected to be completed in 1990.

Marking its 25th anniversary in 1989, the Joint FAO/IAEA Division continued to perform important research related to the utilization of isotopes and ionizing radiation in such areas as pest control, animal health and nutrition, plant breeding and food preservation. In 1989 the Joint Division joined in an emergency effort aimed at eradicating from North Africa an infestation of the screwworm fly through the release of insects, sterilized by radiation. The sterile insect technique (SIT) has been used successfully both to eradicate the screwworm fly from the United States, and to counter the impact of other devastating insect pests (for example, infestations of the Mediterranean Fruit Fly in California and Florida). Given U.S. expertise in this field, Americans on the Joint Division staff and experts provided by the United States on a short-term, cost-free basis, were able to offer valuable advice and assistance in developing an approach to address the potentially catastrophic effects of the screwworm fly in North Africa.

SPECIAL ISSUES

Environment

In 1989 IAEA Director General Blix sought to establish a central role for the IAEA in exploring the prospective use of nuclear power as a means of reducing the accumulation of "greenhouse gases" in the earth's atmosphere. In his statement to the February Board, Blix provided a broad overview of the potential contribution of the Agency in this regard:

> We have entered into a period when the fossil energy sources which dominate the world's energy use are being viewed from new, more critical environmental perspectives. These fuels will remain dominant, but an expansion in their global use is problematic and a reduction in the total volume of their use is desired. In this situation, energy policies are likely to be high on the agenda. All this does not translate into an automatic renaissance for nuclear energy. It is clear that nuclear energy has many advantages as an environmentally safe and economically attractive means of meeting global energy requirements. But it is not enough just to assert this. People need to be convinced that nuclear safety is further strengthened, that waste is responsibly handled and that no proliferation occurs. The Agency is a central mechanism for international cooperation to achieve these objectives.

In March 1989 Blix sent letters to the leaders of the economic "Summit Seven" countries with an appeal that, at their July meeting in Paris, they publicly acknowledge that "many different measures need to be taken to counter the threat of global warming . . . " including "action to expand the use of nuclear power." In response, President Bush noted that the issue of global warming would indeed be discussed at the Summit, and indicated that the United States is "dedicated to increasing the safety, efficiency, use and public acceptability of nuclear power."

Blix repeatedly highlighted, in both public fora and private discussions, the potential role of the IAEA in helping to resolve matters related to the generation of energy resources in an environmentally acceptable manner. These issues were a central theme of Blix's meetings, in April and November, with senior U.S. officials, including National Security Advisor Scowcroft, Secretary of State Baker, Secretary of Energy Watkins, EPA Administrator Reilly, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Chairman Carr and members of Congress.

As part of its focus on environmental issues, the IAEA presented to the February Board, and later to the 44th session of the UN General Assembly, a report on the Agency's contribution "towards achieving the objectives of environmentally sound and sustainable development." The report—which was submitted to the Board pursuant to a resolution adopted by the 1988 IAEA General Conference—detailed the Agency's program activities in this area and addressed the recommendations related to nuclear power contained in two documents reviewed by the UN General Assembly: the "Environmental Perspective to the Year 2000 and Beyond," and the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development.

Looking to the future, the Agency sponsored, at the 1989 General Conference, a special scientific session related to the new generation of power reactors. The day-and-a-half session, which was chaired by former U.S. Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger, brought together representatives from nuclear suppliers, utilities, and regulators to discuss means by which nuclear power could assist in meeting future energy needs.

In addition, Director General Blix appealed to members of the IAEA Board in June to "give urgent consideration to a voluntary support program in the field of public information," which would aim to enhance public understanding of radiation protection, disposal of nuclear wastes, safeguards, nuclear safety and related issues through such means as regional seminars and periodic media briefings. To assist in this effort, the United States made available the services of a cost-free expert to work in the Agency's division of public information.

Liability for Nuclear Damage

Pursuant to a resolution passed by the 1988 General Conference, the Board established (in February 1989) an open-ended working group to consider all aspects of liability for nuclear damage. Meeting in both the spring and fall of 1989, the working group focused its efforts on identifying gaps in—with a view to strengthening—the existing civil liability regime (composed of the Paris and supplementary Brussels Conventions and the Vienna Convention on civil liability); it also considered the issue of state liability. In formulating its final report to the Board in early November, the working group recommended, *inter alia*, that—instead of extending the mandate of the working group—the Board authorize the existing Standing Committee on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage to consider a broader range of topics, and to continue the study of issues related to civil and state liability. This committee—to be renamed the "Standing Committee on Liability for Nuclear Damage" —would

best copy available

also be responsible for reviewing problems related to the Vienna Convention, and for making both substantive and administrative arrangements for a revision conference for parties to the convention.

Dumping of Nuclear Wastes

In response to a request by the General Conference in 1988, the Director General established a representative technical working group of experts for the purpose of elaborating an internationally agreed voluntary code of practice for international transactions involving nuclear wastes. Meeting once in 1989, the group discussed elements which would be addressed in the code, and requested the IAEA Secretariat to formulate a draft code for consideration at a follow-on meeting scheduled for early 1990. The group acknowledged the relevance of the recently negotiated Basel Convention on the disposal of hazardous wastes, as well as existing international guidelines and regulations pertaining to safety, transportation, and physical security of nuclear material and to the management of nuclear waste. The 1989 General Conference adopted a resolution expressing hope that the working group could complete its draft code of practice for submission to the 1990 IAEA General Conference.

POLITICAL ISSUES

Israeli Nuclear Activities

In accordance with the 1988 General Conference resolution on "Israeli Nuclear Capabilities and Threat," the IAEA prepared a technical study on the modalities of safeguards applications in the Middle East. The study, which was submitted to the June Board for review and to the General Conference, details the Agency's experience in applying safeguards under various types of agreements, outlines safeguards and other requirements contained in existing regional treaties (Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, EURATOM), and describes the current status of peaceful nuclear activities and safeguards in Middle East states. The study concluded with several recommendations for action by states in the region in order to promote application of IAEA safeguards throughout the Middle East: (1) conclusion of the requisite IAEA safeguards agreements by NPT parties; (2) adherence to the NPT (by non-parties) and conclusion of the required safeguards agreement; and (3) conclusion of voluntary full-scope safeguards agreements by non-NPT parties.

As a follow-on to the Agency's study, the 1989 General Conference requested the Director General to consult with member states in the Middle East region "with a view to applying Agency safeguards to all nuclear installations in the area . . . ." Although the resolution—adopted by a vote of 47 to 28 (U.S.) with 12 abstentions—contained familiar criticism of Israel's nuclear policies, it represented a further step away from politically motivated criticism of Israel, in favor of constructive initiatives aimed at encouraging the application of comprehensive safeguards throughout the Middle East.

pages tightly bound

PLO Participation

Given attempts by the PLO to expand its participation in other UN bodies under the name "Palestine," the United States undertook concerted efforts to make clear that any enhancement of the PLO's status as an observer at the IAEA General Conference would be unacceptable. Ultimately, action by the 1989 Conference was limited to an announcment by the Conference President that the PLO's nameplate would be changed to "Palestine," with no alteration in the organization's status in the IAEA.

South African Membership

In June 1987 the IAEA Board voted, over U.S. objections, to recommend to the General Conference suspension of South Africa's rights and privileges of membership. While political in nature, African nations sought to link the proposed suspension to South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear program. In response to this action, the United States strongly and actively opposed efforts to suspend South Africa on the grounds that such a move would violate the principle of universality in international organizations, was illegal under the IAEA Statute, and would undermine attempts to encourage further non-proliferation undertakings by South African authorities.

Action on the suspension proposal was deferred at both the 1987 and 1988 General Conference sessions following indications by South Africa that it would undertake serious consultations on possible adherence to the NPT with the three depositary states (U.S., U.K., U.S.S.R.). Pending national elections in South Africa, and the prospect of movement towards NPT adherence by the newly-elected South African government, the 1989 General Conference again passed a resolution (59 to 26 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions) which, while critical of South Africa, deferred for 1 year action with respect to the 1987 Board recommendation to suspend South Africa's membership in the IAEA.

BUDGETARY MATTERS

In 1989 the Agency's program activities were carried out within the limits of an overall budget which reflected a slight decrease, in real terms, from 1988 levels. With the exception of modest increases in 1987–1988 for extraordinary safety initiatives undertaken in the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident, the IAEA has maintained essentially a zero real growth budget since 1984, despite growing demands on its safeguards, technical assistance and other resources.

Although the Agency's overall cash-flow situation in 1989 had improved over previous years, Director General Blix continued to express concern over late payment of assessments by major donor states. In his statement to the September Board, Blix appealed for urgent payment of outstanding contributions in order to avert implementation of emergency measures, noting that, "the Agency's flexibility to adapt its payments to the cash inflow is very limited, as 70 percent of the budget represents staff costs." In order to help alleviate the Agency's short-term cash-flow difficulties, the Board approved a further $2 million increase in the IAEA's Working Capital Fund (to $6 million).

Total resources appropriated by the General Conference for the Agency's 1989 budget amounted to over $157 million. The U.S. assessment—approximately 25 percent of the IAEA's total annual resources—amounted to an estimated $38 million. (Since payment is required in both U.S. dollars and Austrian schillings, this total varies in accordance with the dollar/schilling rate of exchange.) By the end of 1989, the United States had contributed $35.16 million from FY 1990 appropriations toward its 1989 assessment. The balance of the U.S. payment (roughly $2.4 million) is expected to be provided, pending repeal of Section 614 of P.L. 101-162, which limits expenditures for the Department of State to the level appropriated for FY 1989. The 1989 U.S. voluntary contribution for the IAEA amounted to $22 million, which was used to support the provision of cash and in-kind assistance to the IAEA and its member states.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On October 25 Director General Blix presented to the 44th session of the UN General Assembly the Agency's 1988 annual report on implementation of its program activities. At the outset of his statement, Blix noted that 1989 marked the 200th anniversary of the discovery of uranium and the 50th anniversary of nuclear fission—two events which continue to shape the Agency's role in preventing the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, and in promoting the benefits of nuclear fission in meeting global energy needs. Blix went on to express optimism about the Agency's ability to accomplish both of these tasks.

With regard to the IAEA's non-proliferation role, Blix noted that, at the 1990 Conference to review the implementation of the NPT, "The IAEA will report that it verifies the exclusively peaceful use of 95 percent of all nuclear facilities in non-nuclear-weapons states . . . ." In relation to the Agency's promotional role—particularly with respect to energy production—Blix described the potential role of nuclear power in offering a "significant contribution to the world energy balance almost entirely free of gases causing acid rain and climate change." Observing that "all energy options have some problems," Blix urged that "a narrow focusing on problems connected with nuclear power . . . give way to an examination of all available options from a variety of viewpoints, notably safety, health, environment and cost." He went on to describe the Agency's important activities in the area of nuclear safety and waste management, and drew attention to the IAEA's role in supporting sustainable development.

Speaking on behalf of the United States, Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Alexander Watson, commended the Director General on the preparation of the 1988 annual report, observing that it "clearly demonstrates the continuity, the constancy of purpose, and the programmatic effectiveness that have characterized the Agency . . . ." Reaffirming the United States' "firm support for the IAEA," Ambassador Watson underscored the Agency's "principle role in helping to preserve global peace and security, serving as one of the most important institutional barriers to the proliferation of nuclear weapons." He went on to highlight the Agency's activities in support of nuclear safety, the physical protection of nuclear materials, nuclear liability, radioactive waste management, technical cooperation and expanded use of nuclear power as an alternative to the use of fossil fuels.

The General Assembly subsequently adopted, by consensus, a resolution taking note of the 1988 annual report, emphasizing the importance of the Agency's program activities and urging effective international cooperation in support of the Agency's work.

Part 3

Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

INTRODUCTION

UN concern for decolonization stems from the principles of equality and self-determination espoused in the UN Charter. Chapter XI of the Charter sets forth the responsibilities of states for "the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." These "non-self-governing territories" are considered annually by the Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Committee of 24)* and by the General Assembly's Fourth Committee. The C-24 makes suggestions and recommendations to the Fourth Committee regarding implementation of the UN General Assembly resolution 1514 of 1960, the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples," specific issues affecting the decolonization process, such as the activities of foreign economic and military interests in non-self-governing territories and the activities of specialized agencies and other UN bodies in those territories.

The United States is committed firmly to self-determination for all peoples. However, it does not agree with the view of the C-24 that equates self-determination only with independence. The United States views independence as only one possible outcome of self-determination, and the status of a territory must reflect the freely expressed wishes of its people. General Assembly resolutions 1514 and 1541 of 1960 explicitly recognize the following as legitimate outcomes of the act of self-determination for a non-self-governing territory: independence, free association with an independent state or integration with an independent state. Thus, the outcome of the act of self-determination should be determined by the freely expressed wishes of the people of the territory.

---

*Members of the C-24 in 1989 were: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Norway, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

It is also the position of the United States that whether or not military bases interfere with the right of self-determination can be decided only on a case-by-case basis, after careful examination of the special circumstances of the territory in question. The United States has consistently opposed General Assembly resolutions calling for specialized agency cooperation with, and assistance to, "national liberation movements."

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Chapter XII of the UN Charter established an international trusteeship system. Of the original 11 trusts, the sole remaining UN trusteeship is the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI). The Trusteeship Council consists of the five Permanent Members of the Security Council: China, France, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and the United States, which is the Administering Authority for TTPI.

In its 19th special session March 16–17, by vote of 3 (U.S.) to 1 (U.S.S.R.), the Trusteeship Council agreed to dispatch a Visiting Mission to Palau, at the invitation of the United States. Two Council members and three Secretariat officials participated in the 10-day mission, charged with observing social, economic and political conditions and Palau's state of preparedness to assume self-government. This was the first such mission since 1985.

The 56th session, May 15–June 1, elected the United Kingdom president and France vice president. The Trusteeship Council welcomed the People's Republic of China, which was participating in the work of the Council for the first time.

Ambassador Byrne of the United States noted in her opening statement the Government of Palau's smooth democratic transition following the death of President Salii, Palau's continuing progress on political and economic matters and the Administering Authority's commitment to carrying out its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement.

The Visiting Mission, which the United Nations had dispatched to TTPI in April, presented its report to the Trusteeship Council. The Mission reported it had received complaints about road construction, which the Mission questioned as a priority, and the hospital, noting the Administering Authority had already appropriated funds for a needed replacement. The report noted that some Palauans had expressed certain concerns over compensation for land that might be used for military purposes and that nuclear matters were of concern only to a few people. The Mission also noted the Palauans' desire for assurances of an "appropriate level of infrastructure" as a condition for entry into force of the proposed Compact.

By a vote of 4 (U.S.) to 1, the Council adopted the report of the Visiting Mission. The conclusions and recommendations section noted Palau's high degree of political development, minimal support for any option other than free association, anxiety over ending Trusteeship and numerous accomplishments on political and educational fronts.

Palau, in its closing statement to the Trusteeship Council, expressed its view that the conditions for self-sufficiency and political stability had not yet been established.

The conclusions and recommendations of the Trusteeship Council report to the Security Council recalled resolution 2183 (LIII) of May 28, 1986, which stated that the United States had satisfactorily discharged its duties and called for the process of Compact approval to be completed at the earliest date. On August 1 the Trusteeship Council reconvened to adopt the report for forwarding to the Security Council by vote of 4 (U.S.) to 1 (U.S.S.R.), thus bringing the 56th session to a formal close.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Since 1947 the United States has administered the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI). Article 83 of the UN Charter assigns responsibility for strategic trusts to the Security Council, which in turn delegates the oversight task to the Trusteeship Council. The United States cooperates fully with, and reports annually to, the Trusteeship Council.

TTPI originally consisted of more than 2,100 small islands known collectively as Micronesia, a total land area of about 700 square miles in an area of the Pacific Ocean roughly equivalent in size to the continental United States. The area included three distinct island groups: the Marianas (excluding Guam), the Carolines and the Marshalls. About 100 of the islands are inhabited. The total estimated population is 150,000.

Formerly administered by Japan under a League of Nations mandate, the islands came under U.S. control in World War II. After the founding of the United Nations and its trusteeship system, the United States and the UN Security Council concluded an agreement on July 18, 1947, creating the TTPI as a strategic trust territory under U.S. administration. Since 1951 the U.S. Department of the Interior has administered TTPI.

On May 28, 1986, in resolution 2183 (LIII), the Trusteeship Council determined that the United States had fulfilled its obligations as trustee and asked it to make arrangements for trusteeship termination by September 30, 1986, according to the new status arrangements negotiated with TTPI governments and ratified by their peoples in UN-observed acts of self-determination.

As a result of these arrangements, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) became sovereign, self-governing states in free association with the United States. A third TTPI entity, the Northern Mariana Islands, became a self-governing U.S. commonwealth.

The Trusteeship Agreement, therefore, now applies only to the fourth TTPI entity, the Republic of Palau, whose status has not been finalized. The United States and Palau have negotiated a Compact of Free Association, under which Palau would have a status comparable to that of the RMI and the FSM. Efforts to bring the Compact into effect have been thwarted by an inability to obtain the 75 percent Palau voter approval necessary to reconcile nuclear provisions of the Compact with non-nuclear provisions of the Palauan Constitution.

During 1989 President Etpison and a Congress composed of representative group clans were sworn into power. In April the government welcomed the UN Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission, which concluded that the great majority of Palauans preferred free association with the United States over independence or commonwealth status options. A May 26 subsidiary agreement negotiated in Guam addressed specific outstanding Palauan concerns, including a hospital and prison, special prosecutor and special auditor, defense site acquisitions, medical referrals and drug education and treatment programs.

In August President Etpison announced a plebescite would be held pending U.S. Congressional approval of Compact implementation legislation. The U.S. Congress passed this legislation, House Joint Resolution 175, in early November. On November 24 President Etpison authorized a plebescite for February 6, 1990, to determine if 75 percent of the voters were in favor of adopting the Compact.

In view of the UN Charter's clear delegation for oversight of strategic trusts to the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council, the United States continued its policy of nonparticipation in the work of the C–24 regarding TTPI.

U.S. TERRITORIES

Special Committee Consideration

The Committee of 24 considered American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands on August 7. As the administrative authority concerned, the United States presented statements on the U.S. territories to the C–24's Subcommittee on Small Territories in May, and provided information on these territories to the UN Secretariat, in accordance with Article 73 (e) of the UN Charter.

American Samoa

American Samoa is an unincorporated and unorganized U.S. territory located 2,300 miles southwest of Hawaii. It comprises seven islands in the South Pacific, and has a total area of 76 square miles and a population of about

35,000. The United States acquired six of the islands through agreements with indigenous leaders during the early 1900's and the seventh in 1925.

The C-24 adopted the conclusions and recommendations of its Subcommittee on Small Territories concerning American Samoa and decided to submit a draft resolution to the General Assembly. Among other things, the draft reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of American Samoa to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to take all necessary steps to expedite the process of decolonization in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the declaration. The resolution also noted the importance of fostering an awareness among the people of American Samoa of the possibilities open to them in exercising their right to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to strengthen and diversify the economy of the territory. It also urged the United States to safeguard the right of American Samoans to the natural resources of the territory, including marine resources.

Guam

Guam is an organized, unincorporated U.S. territory. It was ceded to the United States by Spain in 1898 at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War. About 30 miles long and 4 to 8 miles wide, Guam is the southernmost island in the volcanic Mariana Islands chain in the Western Pacific, about 6,000 miles west of San Francisco. It has a population of approximately 115,000.

The C–24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The resolution, *inter alia,* reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Guam to self-determination and independence and noted the C–24's strong conviction that military bases and installations in Guam could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of the declaration. It urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures not to involve the territory in offensive military acts and to comply fully with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the declaration and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities. It also urged the United States to strengthen and diversify Guam's economy, especially in the areas of commercial fishing and agriculture and to safeguard the right of the Guamanians to the natural resources of the territory, including its marine resources. It reaffirmed the importance of promoting Guam's unique cultural identity.

U.S. Virgin Islands

The U.S. Virgin Islands, also an organized and unincorporated U.S. territory, were purchased from Denmark in 1917. The most prominent of these islands located 1,000 miles southeast of Miami are St. Thomas, St. Croix and St. John. The population of the territory is about 110,000, and total land area is approximately 130 square miles.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence, noted with satisfaction that the territorial Commission on Status and Federal Relations had started work in preparation for a referendum on the territory's future status, and calls upon the United States to foster an awareness among the people of the possibilities open to them in the exercise of their right to self-determination. It also reaffirms the responsibility of the United States to continue to promote economic and social development of the U.S. Virgin Islands, urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures to comply with the purposes and principles of the Charter and General Assembly resolutions that relate to military activities in non-self-governing territories.

General Assembly Action

American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands were considered, along with a number of other small territories, during the annual session of the Fourth Committee held during the month of October under the agenda item "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

On October 25 the Fourth Committee adopted the resolutions on American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands without a vote. The plenary adopted resolutions on Guam (Resolution 44/98), American Samoa (Resolution 44/97) and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Resolution 44/99) without a vote on December 11.

The Fourth Committee decided not to include the resolution on Puerto Rico on its agenda. However, it was mentioned in the C-24 report adopted in the Committee and subsequently in plenary.

NAMIBIA

Peacekeeping

Following the signature at UN Headquarters on December 22, 1988, of the Tripartite Agreement by South Africa, Angola, and Cuba and the Bilateral Agreement Between Cuba and Angola, the Security Council turned its attention to the measures needed to begin implementation of resolution 435 of 1978, which had set out the framework for Namibia's transition to independence. Although several other UN bodies and affiliated agencies participated, the Security Council retained direct responsibility for implementation of the transition by the UN Transition Assistance Group in Namibia (UNTAG), and it met frequently through the year, in formal session or informal consultations, to oversee the transition. The Tripartite Agreement, which launched the transition process, also established a Joint Commission (composed of the three signatories, with the United States and the Soviet Union as observers), which also met as necessary to oversee successful implementation of that agreement and the Namibian independence transition.

Many issues confronted the Security Council and the Joint Commission on a repeated basis throughout the year, making a strict chronological discussion in this session impractical. Issues are grouped below into the following general categories: (1) Implementation of Resolution 435, the Downsizing Debate, and Deployment; (2) Repatriation of Namibians and the SWAPO Detainees; (3) Security and Intimidation Issues; (4) Legal and Electoral Arrangements; and (5) The Elections and Their Aftermath.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 435, THE DOWNSIZING DEBATE AND DEPLOYMENT

Provisional plans for implementation, drawn up in 1978 and 1982 when there was considerable fighting along Namibia's border with Angola, provided for a peacekeeping operation far larger than required in 1989, when a *de facto* cease-fire had been reached and tensions were greatly reduced. The five Permanent Members of the Council were concerned that the operation would therefore be far more expensive than necessary or affordable, especially in light of other UN peacekeeping operations recently undertaken in several regions of the world. Working with the UN Secretariat and other members of the Security Council, the Front-Line States (FLS) and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), they began to seek agreement that the operation could be scaled down in size. This proposal met with considerable resistance on the part of the NAM and FLS, who feared that South Africa would seek unfair advantage over the process by force or intimidation and therefore opposed any effort to reduce the size of UNTAG. Nearly 2 months elapsed before the Council was able to reach agreement and allow the deployment to begin.

On January 16, unanimously and without debate, the Council adopted resolution 628, which officially welcomed signature of the bilateral and tripartite agreements. At the same session, the Council also unanimously passed resolution 629. In this resolution, the result of careful compromise over the previous 4 weeks, the Council recognized progress in the peace process in the region, expressed concern at the increase in police and paramilitary forces in Namibia, stressed the need to ensure conditions under which the Namibian people would be able to participate in free and fair elections under UN supervision and control, and noted that recent developments made appropriate a reexamination of the requirements for UNTAG to fullfil its mandate.

The Council therefore agreed that April 1, 1989, be set for the start of implementation of resolution 435 and requested the Secretary General to arrange a formal cease-fire between South Africa and the guerrilla group fighting for

Namibia's independence, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In response to the desire to downsize the operation, resolution 629 also called upon the Secretary General to report to the Council on the implementation of resolution 435, to reexamine requirements for UNTAG in light of current circumstances, and "to identify wherever possible tangible cost-saving measures."

Speaking in Washington after these resolutions were adopted, the State Department Spokesperson said "We welcome these resolutions and the unanimity with which they were adopted. They are the fruit of close and careful consultations among all the members of the Security Council and with the UN Secretariat and interested parties from the region."

The Secretary General issued his report to the Council January 23 (S/20412). In light of conditions in the territory and the extensive mandate set out by resolution 435 and subsequent agreements for the special representative of the Secretary General during the transition phase, he found he could identify no savings in the plans for the special representative and UNTAG's administrative personnel. He also proposed to maintain the provision for some 800 electoral supervisors to be deployed to the territory at the time of the elections for the Constituent Assembly, set for 7 months after the start of implementation.

In light of an increase since 1978 in the size of the South West African Police forces (SWAPOL), the Secretary General proposed to increase the original number of civilian police monitors in UNTAG (CIVPOL) from 360 to 500. He also noted that the military component of UNTAG would bear responsibility for monitoring disbandment of paramilitary forces, including the anti-insurgency unit known as Koevoet.

Military planning in 1978 and 1982 had called for deployment of 6 infantry battalions, 200 military observers, and 2,300 logistic and support personnel, for a total military component of 6,800, with a seventh authorized battalion to be held in reserve. The Secretary General now proposed deploying 3 augmented infantry battalions of 850 troops each, increasing the number of military observers to 300, and reducing logistic troops to 1,700 plus a headquarters staff of 100, for a total force level of 4,650. The other four battalions would be held in reserve. He added that "if it became apparent during the course of the transitional period that a military force of this size was insufficient," and "that there was a real need for additional personnel," he would, after informing the Council, deploy as many of the reserve battalions as he judged to be necessary. In conclusion, the Secretary General estimated the proposed deployment for UNTAG would cost $416 million, a significant reduction from the $700 million previously estimated.

The Secretary General's report led to further controversy among FLS and NAM members who opposed the proposal to downsize UNTAG. With the other Permanent Members of the Council, the United States lobbied NAM delegates both inside and outside the Council to support the recommendation. In response to some of those concerns, the Secretary General issued an explanatory statement on February 10, 1989 (S/20457). In it, he reaffirmed that "the authorized upper limit for the military component of UNTAG would remain at 7,500 as . . . approved by the Security Council in its resolution 435." He stressed that "the mandate of the military component of UNTAG . . . remains unchanged," and promised to inform the Council if the situation required deployment of additional military personnel. He added that he had received assurances from all Council members, including the Permanent Members, that they would respond promptly to any such need.

Finally, on February 16, the Council adopted resolution 632, which approved the Secretary General's report and explanatory statement on how he intended to implement resolution 435. Again adopted unanimously and without any formal debate, the new resolution also emphasized that resolution 435 was to be implemented "in its original and definitive form . . . ." Ambassador Rana of Nepal, Council President for February, spoke for all members when he stressed that "the agreement to adopt this decision unanimously and without debate underlines the commitment of the Council for early independence of Namibia . . . . We look forward to welcoming Namibia as a fellow member of this family of nations before long." The 43rd General Assembly met in resumed session at the end of the month and approved the budget and scale of assessments for UNTAG, just 4 weeks before the operation was to begin.

The Impartiality Package

One element of the UN settlement plan for Namibia—the series of agreements reached among the parties to the Namibian conflict since adoption of resolution 435 in 1978—had not been made public. This was the so-called "impartiality package," an informal check-list of understandings concerning actions which would be taken or not taken—by the United Nations, the South African authorities or others—to ensure the impartial administration of the transition plan. Among the provisions, the parties agreed that:

— Consideration of the question of Namibia at the regular General Assembly should be suspended during the transition period.

— The United Nations (would) not provide funds for SWAPO or any other party during the transition period.

— The UN Council for Namibia should refrain from engaging in all public activities once the Security Council meets to authorize implementation.

— The Commissioner for Namibia and his office should suspend all political activities during the transition period.

— SWAPO will voluntarily forego the exercise of the special privileges granted to it by the General Assembly, including participation as an official observer in the General Assembly and in other bodies and conferences within the UN system.

The U.S. Delegation worked closely with other members of the Security Council, officials of the UN Secretariat, and the Secretary General to find a way to bring the Impartiality Package into effect, even though it had no force as a Security Council agreement. On May 18 the Secretary General finally released the agreement in parallel letters to the Security Council President and the President of the General Assembly (Documents S/20635 and A/44/280). He pointed out that his report of January 23 had referred to agreements and understandings such as this, reached by the parties since adoption of resolution 435, and which remained binding upon the parties. He therefore felt it appropriate to bring the Impartiality Package to the formal attention of all Security Council members.

The Council for Namibia, as a body created by the General Assembly and not the Security Council, had felt that it was not bound by the Impartiality Package, but following publication of the agreements it did generally abide by restrictions on its activity during the transition period. All other elements of the UN system, as well as the other parties to the settlement, also adhered to the provisions which had been agreed. As a result, aside from decisions on UNTAG funding the General Assembly did not consider the question of Namibia during the transition period, although the topic remained on the agenda of the 44th General Assembly. As required, SWAPO agreed voluntarily to relinquish UN funding and not to exercise the privileges accorded to it as an observer at the United Nations.

U.S. Airlift Assistance for UNTAG

Although the United States had offered to provide airlift support for all of UNTAG's military deployment a decade earlier (when resolution 435 was passed), it informed the United Nations now that to save costs the United States would be prepared to offer only selected airlift assistance. To keep overall expenses down, the United Nations decided to use civilian air charter and sea transport where possible during the deployment and redeployment of UNTAG. At UN request several U.S. military and civilian logistics experts were detailed to the Field Operations Division at UN Headquarters throughout the year, to assist in planning and implementing deployment of UNTAG—the largest UN peacekeeping operation since the Congo in the 1960's.

In response to a request from the Secretariat, the United States did agree to move essential advance equipment and personnel by air, free of charge to the United Nations, at the start of UNTAG's deployment. As a result, C-5 aircraft from the U.S. Air Force Military Airlift Command transported urgently needed members and equipment of the Engineer Company from Australia, the Signals Unit from Great Britain, the Medical Unit from Switzerland and the Helicopter Unit from Italy, as well as assorted supplies from UN stockpiles in the United States and Europe. Other equipment and personnel were transported with the understanding that the cost would be credited against the U.S. assessment for the UNTAG operation. Over 900 hours of flying, including two complete trips around the globe, were involved in this U.S. Air Force contribution to Namibian independence, code named "Operation Election District."

UNTAG's Military Contingent

The UNTAG military contingent reached full operational strength of 4,487 on June 15, with augmented infantry battalions from Finland, Malaysia and Kenya, as well as major units provided by Austria, Canada, Denmark, Poland, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. (The civilian Swiss medical unit marked the first time that neutral Switzerland, not a UN member, had participated in a UN peacekeeping operation. The Federal Republic of Germany, prohibited by its constitution from deploying troops outside Western Europe, also provided a civilian contingent.) Thirteen other countries provided military personnel for UNTAG's initial deployment.

REPATRIATION OF NAMIBIANS BY UNHCR AND THE ISSUE OF SWAPO DETAINEES

As part of the Namibia settlement plan under resolution 435, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was responsible for the registration, repatriation and resettlement of Namibians from Angola, Zambia and elsewhere around the world. The Secretary General issued a separate appeal for this operation, which although falling under the umbrella of UNTAG was carried out by the UNHCR and his staff, who worked in close liaison with UNTAG throughout the entire process. During a pledging conference held in New York on March 16 at which the UNHCR proposed a budget of $38.5 million for the repatriation operation, over 30 countries and regional groupings pledged assistance. The United States pledged $5 million, the largest donation by a single country. Ambassador Patricia Byrne, U.S. Representative at the conference, noted that "repatriation will help give all eligible voters an opportunity to participate in the process of free elections and independence," adding that the United States was pleased to participate in the repatriation exercise.

Earlier estimates of the number of Namibians eligible for repatriation by the UNHCR ranged as high as 65,000. In the event, just over 42,000 Namibians registered for repatriation, the vast majority at SWAPO-run camps in Angola with a smaller number at similar camps in Zambia, and in scattered groups elsewhere around the world. Because of the fighting at the beginning of April (see page 287 of this report), which also delayed the withdrawal of SADF troops and disbandment of SWATF, the proclamations granting amnesty to returning Namibians were not agreed and published until the first week of June. Repatriation began on June 12.

During a 14-week period from June to September, the Namibian returnees were brought back to their home country, primarily via chartered aircraft, and were processed through three repatriation centers, one near Windhoek and two further north in the country, whence most of them had originally come. Although some tarried in or returned to the camps through fears for their safety, most were processed through and reabsorbed into society fairly quickly.

The SWAPO Detainees

Soon after the start of the transition, serious allegations were brought forward to the Secretary General's special representative from a number of sources, including Namibians, that SWAPO continued to detain Namibians opposed to it at locations in Angola, Zambia and elsewhere. SWAPO admitted that during the liberation war it had arrested and detained Namibians but said they were sent to spy against it by South Africa. SWAPO asserted that it no longer held any Namibians against their will. In late May, however, some 200 detainees were released by SWAPO in Angola. Although they had been described as the last such group, 2 months later an additional 84 persons who had been detained by SWAPO were repatriated by the UNHCR. Many of them told tales of torture and murder in the SWAPO-run camps, and lengthy lists of alleged victims were drawn up, including some persons still reported to be in detention. The Government of South Africa, private and nongovernmental organizations and some political parties opposed to SWAPO called for an energetic investigation of these allegations. Disturbed by the allegations, the United States and other observers supported the calls for an investigation.

On August 23 SWAPO officials held a press conference in Windhoek at which they offered permission for UNHCR, the media and "any interested party" to visit SWAPO camps to verify that no detainees were being held. They admitted that some SWAPO security personnel had "taken the law into their own hands" and "committed acts of torture and brutality." SWAPO regretted these acts "very much." SWAPO again asserted that many of those who had been detained by it during the liberation struggle were in fact spies working on behalf of South Africa, but admitted some had been innocent and that the issue had torn families apart. Since the settlement plan contained express provision requiring the special representative to be satisfied that all Namibians who remained outside the territory did so of their own free will, a special mission was organized by UNTAG in August to look into the allegations.

Under the chairmanship of Ambassador B. A. Clark of Sierra Leone, this special mission compiled a list of over 1,100 names of Namibians who were allegedly still in detention, as well as a list of alleged places of detention. The team left Windhoek on September 2, visiting over 20 sites in Angola and 8 in Zambia, including some sites not on their original list. Special Representative Ahtisaari announced the findings of the mission on October 11. The team had found no detainees at any of the alleged detention centers in Angola or Zambia, and on the basis of interviews with local inhabitants, it found no evidence to indicate any detainees had been moved away before its visit.

At all places it visited, the UNTAG mission found that virtually all Namibians had already been repatriated by the UNHCR; those who remained either intended to return shortly or had voluntarily decided not to return at that time. The team had cross-checked the list of 1,100 names it had been given and announced the following results: 110 names were duplications; 484 had been released and/or already repatriated; 71 individuals, including current SWAPO officials, were reportedly never detained; 115 persons were reported or suspected to be dead; 52 names could not be traced due to lack of adequate information; and 315 persons could not in fact be accounted for. Some of those on the list of people allegedly detained were already registered as voters in Namibia.

Since the mission faced many logistical obstacles and was dependent on the governments of Angola and Zambia for support, this report was not regarded as wholly satisfactory by opponents of SWAPO and others. The special representative decided that in light of the available evidence, however, it was not serious enough to have a negative impact overall on the holding of free and fair elections as called for in resolution 435 and the settlement plan. The issue was never entirely resolved to the satisfaction of many. Even after the elections were over, the United States continued to press SWAPO and the UN Secretariat for the fullest possible accounting of the missing persons.

SECURITY AND INTIMIDATION ISSUES

The April Fool's Invasion

Notwithstanding U.S. airlift support, the delay in approval of the operation by the Security Council and General Assembly meant that UNTAG's civilian and military personnel were not fully deployed when implementation began on April 1. Although both the Government of South Africa and SWAPO had agreed to a formal cease-fire from April 1, fighting broke out that same morning as SWAPOL patrols encountered large numbers of armed combatants crossing into the territory from Angola. With the approval of the Secretary General, Special Representative Martti Ahtisaari authorized South African Defense Forces (SADF) and South West African Territorial Forces (SWATF) to leave their bases—to which they were confined under the implementation plan—to deal with the SWAPO fighters. Non-Aligned and Front Line States, traditional supporters of SWAPO, were extremely distressed by the apparent reversal of the transition plan's provisions that SADF and SWATF be confined to base, and Special Representative Ahtisaari was accused of pro-South African bias.

To assist UN efforts to regain authority over the transition process, the U.S. Air Force in early April provided emergency airlift for the Finnish Battalion, moving to Namibia in the space of 5 days all its men from Helsinki and the material it would need from the United Kingdom. This airlift provided Special Representative Ahtisaari with sufficient troops to lend credence to UNTAG's role as a peacekeeper during an extremely tense period in Namibia's transition.

The Joint Commission established by the Tripartite Agreement met in emergency session at Mount Etjo in Namibia in the days after fighting broke out. Officials from UNTAG and the Office of the South African appointed Administrator General of Namibia were invited to attend this and all subsequent sessions of the Joint Commission. Under the leadership of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester Crocker, the Joint Commission developed arrangements to end the fighting by ensuring that the SWAPO combatants returned to bases north of the 16th parallel in Angola, while SADF and SWATF forces were again confined to base, pending their withdrawal from the territory or disbandment as required under the transition plan.

Despite this successful diplomatic effort, a shadow had been cast over the implementation process. SWAPO was accused of purposefully violating the cease-fire; they responded with the assertion they were only trying to return to their homeland and were betrayed by UNTAG. The good faith and impartiality of the special representative had been called into question. Over 300 SWAPO combatants and nearly 50 SADF and SWATF personnel were killed before the fighting ended. The implementation timetable slipped by several weeks, and there was concern that the overall 12-month calendar could not be adhered to.

The issue of civilian security rose again in August, this time as a result of widespread reports of intimidation of civilians by SWAPOL, especially by former members of the paramilitary anti-insurgency unit Koevoet. Instead of this unit being completely disbanded, as required under resolution 435 and subsequent agreements, most of its members had been integrated into SWAPOL. Trained only for counterinsurgency operations, they were felt to be ruthless anti-SWAPO operatives, and the population in pro-SWAPO regions of the country felt Koevoet was continuing to operate in its previous manner. In a confidential report to the Security Council August 3 on his July visit to the territory, the Secretary General stated that while "implementation of the UN plan is on track and Namibia's independence is at hand," he was still concerned at the continued presence in SWAPOL of ex-members of Koevoet. The issue became the subject of recurrent discussion by Security Council members throughout August 1989, with numerous informal consultations of the Council in New York and demarches in capitals.

Western and other members of the Council believed that formal debate was not required, preferring to raise the issue in bilateral multipartite demarches with the South African Government. Typical of the opposing views expressed was a communique on Namibia issued August 10 by the Coordinating Bureau of the NAM, circulated as an official UN document at the request of Zimbabwe. The communique reported SWAPO assertions on "continuing serious irregularities in the implementation of the independence plan resulting from South Africa's persistent refusal to comply with some key aspects of resolution 435." The NAM felt "the minimum conditions for holding a free and fair election did not yet exist in Namibia," and was "surprised that the Security Council had still not taken action to compel South Africa to fulfil its obligations under resolution 435, despite the substantiated reports on the serious situation in Namibia." (S/20784.)

At the request of the African Group and NAM members, the Council met for 5 days of formal debate, from August 16 to 22, hearing over 30 speakers, most of them African. Many adopted a calm and reasoned tone, but the push for a formal resolution continued. After a week of negotiations, members of the Council reached agreement on a compromise text for a resolution, based on a non-aligned draft but taking account of United States and other concerns. This text was adopted unanimously and without further debate on August 29. (Resolution 640.)

Resolution 640 noted with concern that not all provisions of resolution 435 were being fully complied with; expressed concern at reports of widespread intimidation by Koevoet elements in SWAPOL; demanded strict compliance by all parties concerned, especially South Africa, with resolutions 435 and 632; demanded disbandment of all paramilitary and ethnic forces, in particular Koevoet; called on the Secretary General to review the situation on the ground to determine the adequacy of UNTAG's military component; and invited him to review the number of police monitors "in order to undertake the process for any appropriate increase he may deem necessary . . . ." The resolution also asked him to ensure that all legislation concerning the electoral process was in conformity with the settlement plan and that all proclamations conform with internationally accepted norms for the conduct of free and fair elections and to ensure observance of strict impartiality in provision of media facilities for all parties, and it appealed to all parties concerned to cooperate fully with him. The Secretary General was asked to report to the Council again before the end of September.

Speaking in explanation of the U.S. vote, Ambassador Thomas Pickering noted that since adoption of resolution 435 members of the Council had worked closely and constructively on the Namibian issue, and numerous resolutions had reemphasized the will to resolve the Namibian situation through a peaceful transition. Many speakers in the current debate had mentioned problems in implementation, but all knew the road would be a difficult one. "Past experience has shown that the combined, unanimous will of the international community will prevail on Namibia's behalf." The United States had worked closely to bring the current debate to a successful conclusion, "in the belief that the success of the Namibia settlement depends in large measure on the unity and cohesiveness of the Security Council on this issue." He added the U.S. understanding, based on recent consultations, that any decision on actual deployment of additional civilian personnel for UNTAG would be taken by the Secretary General in appropriate consultation with the Council. Unity in support of the the Secretary General and UNTAG were key to their success, he concluded.

Police Monitors Increased

The tensions which resulted from the April fighting, plus inevitable friction between SWAPOL and the local population, led the Secretary General to request additional police monitors from the Security Council in May. Through an exchange of letters between the Secretary General and the Security Council President, the Council agreed to the dispatch of 500 additional Civilian Police Monitors (CIVPOL). This brought to 1,000 the number of CIVPOL authorized under UNTAG. As before, their task was to monitor police operations by SWAPOL and to receive reports of violence or intimidation, not to conduct normal police operations themselves.

As authorized under resolution 640, the Secretary General requested authority for more police monitors in September, again as the result of tensions between elements of SWAPOL (primarily Koevoet) and the civilian population. The Council gave approval for a further 500 civilian police monitors, and they were deployed to Namibia from contributing members states by mid-October. The final number of CIVPOL personnel serving with UNTAG was 1,486.

The Code of Conduct

In early September, Special Representative Ahtisaari brought together the political parties running in the election campaign in a series of meetings where they agreed on a code of conduct, to be binding upon them and all their followers. Among the positions to which all agreed, they noted that :

— intimidation in any form was unacceptable;

— party leaders would tell followers not to bring weapons to rallies, meetings, etc.;

— parties would notify SWAPOL and UNTAG's CIVPOL of planned rallies, which would not be held at conflicting times or locations;

— parties would not disrupt one another's meetings;

— lines of communication would be established among parties and with the police, they would meet every 2 weeks with UNTAG district officials to discuss matters of concern, and all allegations of intimidation would be promptly brought to the attention of SWAPOL and CIVPOL; and

— finally, the party leaders all undertook to honor the outcome of elections once the special representative had certified them to have been conducted in a free and fair manner.

This agreed code of conduct marked a turning point in the campaign, and the atmosphere greatly improved as these provisions were implemented by all the parties. Both SWAPOL and CIVPOL reported steadily dwindling numbers of complaints and fewer and fewer verified instances of intimidation, as the parties went about their electoral business in a peaceful manner. It contributed significantly to the successful outcome of the elections overall.

The Secretary General reported to the Council on October 6, as requested in resolution 640. The 28-page document reported in detail on the withdrawal or restriction to base of SADF, the demobilization of SWATF, the disbandonment of Koevoet, the adequacy of UNTAG's military component and of the current number of police monitors and on agreement on the electoral legislation. The report (S/20883) was upbeat overall, noting problem areas where compliance with resolutions 435 had been improved.

With elections less than a month away, many members of the Council were concerned that not all the conditions necessary had yet been fulfilled, and there were consultations throughout the month concerning what action might be appropriate for the Council to take to ensure the conditions were met. Non-aligned members favored adoption of a resolution, and a draft was circulated during the week of October 16. The immoderate tone of the draft resolution angered the South African authorities and almost led to disruption of an extraordinary meeting of the Joint Commission, taking place in Johannesburg, where Special Representative Ahtisaari and the Administrator General had both reported substantial progress in resolving problems facing Namibia in the weeks before the voting. Negotiations continued in New York and capitals throughout the month. Agreement was reached on a compromise text, which was adopted unanimously and without formal debate on October 31. (Resolution 643.)

Resolution 643 further reiterated the demand that all paramilitary forces, including Koevoet and SWATF, be completely disbanded as required by resolutions 435 and 640 and demanded immediate repeal of such discriminatory laws and regulations as inhibit the holding of free and fair elections. It invited the Secretary General to keep under review the number of police monitors and demanded that SWAPOL extend full cooperation to CIVPOL; it asked him to ensure the territorial integrity and security of Namibia and to assist the Consitituent Assembly in discharge of responsibilities entrusted to it under the settlement plan. Finally, it decided that the Council should convene as required before the elections to review the situation and consider appropriate action, asking the Secretary General for a report on implementation as soon as possible.

On November 1 South African authorities alleged that large numbers of SWAPO fighters were poised just north of Namibia's border with Angola planning to enter the country and disrupt the elections. These allegations proved unfounded, but they again served to illustrate the heightened tension surrounding the transition processs even after 7 months. The Security Council President issued a statement November 3 deploring the false alarm and commending UNTAG's prompt action to clarify the situation and establish that the allegations were unfounded.

With less than 1 week to go before the start of elections on November 3, the Secretary General again reported to the Council, noting that the situation had remained calm since his previous report of October 6. The political campaign was proceeding without hindrance, and while CIVPOL continued to receive complaints of harassment and intimidation, the numbers continued to decrease. Agreement had been reached between the special representative and the Administrator General on the Constituent Assembly Proclamation, and over 1,600 former Koevoet members had been demobilized under UNTAG supervision. He added that 1,695 election monitors, some drawn from UN professional staff but most seconded from member countries, were deployed throughout the country to oversee the election process. He endorsed the conclusion of the special representative that present conditions would permit free and fair elections.

LEGAL AND ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

Amnesty, Repressive Legislation and Release of Prisoners

Among the provisions of the settlement plan under resolution 435, the South African authorities in Namibia were required to issue an amnesty to returning Namibians and to repeal "discriminatory or restrictive legislation" which could have a negative impact on the holding of free and fair elections. The fighting at the beginning of April delayed this essential step, which was required before Namibians who had been outside the country felt free to return. The amnesty and repeal of "discriminatory or restrictive legislation which may abridge or inhibit the objective of free and fair elections" did not take place until early in June.

The South African authorities were also obliged under the settlement plan to release all political prisoners inside Namibia, and any disputes on the issue had to be resolved to the satisfaction of the special representative. On July 20, 23 of 25 political prisoners acknowledged by the Administrator General were released, based on a study carried by the independent jurist assigned to UNTAG. Other prisoners were subsequently identified as "political prisoners," but the special representative did not agree with all the suggestions and a few more were released. The issue of SWAPO prisoners was much more divisive.

The Constitutional Principles

Another of the agreements subsequent to resolution 435 which were part of the overall UN settlement plan for Namibia was agreement on a series of principles on the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution, reached by the parties in 1982. This agreement set out the requirements for universal suffrage, secret ballot, freedom of speech and assembly and fair representation in the Assembly for parties which gain support in the election, as well as principles for the Constitution to be adopted by that Assembly. (S/15287.) The electoral arrangements drawn up by the Administrator General could not meet with the approval of the special representative until and unless they complied with these agreed principles.

Voter Registration

Once the repatriation of Namibians was underway, the South African and UN authorities turned their attention to the next step in the process leading to constituent assembly elections, the registration of voters. As with all elements of the transition process, agreement on voter eligibility was reached after close consultations by the Administrator General with, and the formal approval of, the special representative. Voter registration—for all Namibians over 18, persons who could prove one Namibian parent, or South African civil servants who had taken an oath that they intended to remain in the country after independence—began July 3. Registration was carried out by personnel under the Administrator General, accompanied by UNTAG district officials and observer teams, crisscrossing the country to ensure that all eligible Namibians were inscribed on the rolls.

Although the registration period was supposed to last only until September 16, it was extended by 1 week at the insistence of SWAPO and its supporters in the NAM, who were concerned that some Namibians had not had the opportunity to register. After the rolls were closed, a total of 701,483 voters had been registered, over 103 percent of the number expected by South African authorities. Very few registrations were challenged, and less than a thousand were rejected, in each instance with the approval of the UNTAG representative in the district.

The Parties

Ten parties met registration requirements and ran in the election campaign. The parties were Action Christian National (ACN), Christian Democratic Action (CDA), the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA), the Federal Convention of Namibia (FCN), the Namibia National Democratic Party

(NNDP), the Namibia National Front (NNF), the National Patriotic Front of Namibia (NPF), SWAPO, SWAPO-Democrats and the United Democratic Front (UDF).

The Electoral Code

Negotiations on an acceptable electoral code took most of the summer. The Administrator General proposed a system based on that in place in Namibia earlier, but most observers found it to be cumbersome, open to fraud or manipulation and too deliberate to produce rapid election returns. In particular, it called for a system which might have permitted identification of ballots by voter, and centralized counting of ballots could have delayed final returns by several weeks, clearly unacceptable in a hotly-contested election subject to great international attention. The issue was repeatedly discussed in the Security Council, and a provision of resolution 640 called upon the Secretary General to ensure that all legislation conformed to "internationally accepted norms for free and fair elections." With the help of a UN lawyer dispatched to Namibia precisely for the purpose, the Administrator General and the special representative were able to reach agreement in early October on an acceptable electoral code, which was published only 25 days before voting was due to start. UNTAG officials had active responsibility throughout balloting and vote-counting to ensure that conditions were maintained which would ensure the fairness of the election results.

The Fluorescent Ink

One provision of the electoral arrangements to prevent fraud was the requirement that all voters dip their fingers in an indelible, fluorescent ink which could be detected under ultraviolet light. All persons wishing to vote had to subject their hands to examination under ultraviolet light to prove they had not already voted elsewhere. The Administrator General's office purchased the ink from a firm in the United States, and to ensure there was no question of its authenticity and inviolate nature the ink was transported to Namibia on a special U.S. Air Force flight. The ink was turned over to the Administrator General in the presence of the special representative by Roger McGuire, Director of the U.S. Liaison Office in Windhoek.

THE ELECTIONS AND THEIR AFTERMATH

Although under the scenario established by resolution 435 elections were to take place 7 months after the start of implementation, in fact voting did not begin until November 7, a week later than scheduled. Voting took place over 5 days at more than 400 polling stations throughout the country, including some which traveled to remote villages on a predetermined schedule to reach voters who could not have made the voyage to urban centers. Large numbers of voters showed up at their local polling stations well before the polls opened on the first 2 days, and by the end of the third day nearly 84 percent of registered voters had cast their ballots. Overall, 97 percent of Namibians registered took part in the country's first ever nationwide elections, with 680,688 votes cast, of which only 1.4 percent were declared invalid as spoiled or illegitimate. Roughly 13.6 percent of the ballots were cast by voters outside their electoral district or without all the necessary identification; these "tendered ballots" were counted in Windhoek, while all others were counted in the district where they were cast.

U.S. Presidential Delegation

To demonstrate U.S interest in peaceful, free and fair elections, President Bush appointed a delegation to observe the balloting and vote-counting. Led by former Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie, the delegation included bipartisan representation from Congress and Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs John R. Bolton, as well as knowledgeable observers from the private sector. Most members of the delegation arrived in Namibia aboard a special U.S. Air Force plane on November 9, 1989, and immediately proceeded to the north of the country. Over 5 full days, members of the delegation visited polling stations in Grootfontein, Tsumeb, Ondangwa, Oshakati and Oshivelo, met with UNTAG and election personnel, and talked with journalists, voters and party poll watchers. They also got to see ballots being counted in Swakopmund and followed the returns from around the country via hourly announcements on local radio. Accompanied by the special representative and USLO Director McGuire, Secretary Muskie visited the fair grounds outside Windhoek where the "tendered ballots" were examined and counted.

The delegation returned to Windhoek for meetings with Special Representative Ahtisaari, SWAPO President Sam Nujoma and the Administrator General. Speaking on behalf of the entire delegation at a Windhoek press conference November 14, Secretary Muskie noted that the process witnessed by the delegation was "a victory by and for the people of Namibia . . . a heartening example of peaceful political competition (which) inspires hope that commitment to democratic processes and principles will be maintained in an independent Namibia." He added that

> . . . the triumph of this process is one in which the United States takes great satisfaction. Three administrations—from President Carter to President Reagan to President Bush—have been closely associated with the cause of Namibian independence. We are encouraged that the people of Namibia are now in a position to decide the course of their own future.

Announcement of Results

During the evening of November 14, the special representative made a formal announcement that he found the elections to have been free and fair. Final results gave SWAPO 57.3 percent of the total votes (41 seats in the Assembly), the DTA 28.6 percent (21 seats), UDF had 5.6 percent (4 seats), ACN 3.5 percent (3 seats) and NPF, FCN and NNF one seat each with between 0.8 and 1.6 percent of the votes cast.

The Secretary General issued a report on November 14, 1989 (S/20967), in which he formally notified the Security Council of the electoral procedures agreed to between the special representative and the Administrator General, noted that the elections had proceeded in a peaceful and orderly manner and been declared by the special representative to have been "free and fair," and informed the Council of the results of the balloting. A week later, Security Council President Li of China issued a statement on behalf of Council members which welcomed the successful conclusion of the Constituent Assembly elections; congratulated the special representative, UNTAG and the Namibian people; and reaffirmed the continuing important role of the United Nations in the transition period in ensuring implementation of the settlement plan. The members asked the Secretary General to make the necessary arrangements under the settlement plan to safeguard the territorial integrity and security of Namibia; stressed importance of full compliance with all remaining provisions of resolution 435 in its original and definitive form; and expressed the hope that the "utmost political responsibility be displayed to permit the earliest possible accession of Namibia to independence."

The Constituent Assembly

The 72-member Constituent Assembly convened for the first time on November 21, just a week after the election results had been announced. A spirit of nonpartisan compromise soon emerged as delegates worked to draft a constitution which would meet the aspirations of the Namibian people. All agreed that the document would be based on the 1982 Constitutional Principles, and by December 21 the Assembly had adopted the outline of a draft constitution. Included in the draft were provisions for an executive presidency, a bicameral legislature and elections based on proportional representation. The State Department Spokesperson commended the progress achieved thus far and looked forward to establishment of a government in Namibia founded on multiparty democracy and social justice. Work on the nation-building document continued into the new year, with independence scheduled for April 1, just 1 year after the official start of UNTAG's operation and implementation of the UN settlement plan for Namibia, based on resolution 435 of 1978 and all the agreements which had followed.

PUERTO RICO

Cuba, as in recent years, sponsored a resolution in the Committee of 24 that "reaffirmed" Puerto Rico's right to independence, an option that Puerto Ricans repeatedly have declined to exercise. This year's resolution passed on August 17 by a vote of 9 to 2, with 11 abstentions and 2 absent or not voting. The Fourth Committee opted not to refer the resolution to the plenary October 25, although C–24 results appear in the Fourth Committee report to the General Assembly. The Assembly last voted overwhelmingly in 1982 against a move to inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda.

The United States opposes discussion of Puerto Rico in the C–24 because in 1953, General Assembly resolution 748 removed Puerto Rico from the list of non-self-governing territories, following the decision of the Puerto Rican people that Puerto Rico should become a U.S. Commonwealth. The General Assembly action recognized that Puerto Ricans had exercised their right to self-determination, and that, as a self-governing entity, Puerto Rico was no longer a proper subject for UN consideration under the UN Charter.

WESTERN SAHARA

The conflict in the Western Sahara dates from 1976. When Spain transferred administrative control of the territory to Morocco and Mauritania, the POLISARIA Front launched a guerrilla war against Mauritania and Morocco to obtain independence for the entire territory. Mauritania withdrew from the territory in 1979. Morocco then extended its territorial claims to include the one-third of the Sahara formerly claimed by Mauritania, and the guerrilla war between the POLISARIO Front and Morocco continued. The United States supports a peaceful settlement acceptable to all parties under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations.

As authorized by Security Council resolution 621 (1988), the UN Secretary General appointed a special representative for Western Sahara, Hector Gaos Espiell, a national of Uruguay. During January the special representative carried out a familiarization mission to the Western Sahara and to the capitals of neighboring countries. From June 18–24 the UN Secretary General visited the area and informed King Hassan II of Morocco of his intention to establish a technical commission at UN Headquarters to study ways and means of implementing the settlement proposals agreed to by the two parties.

The Western Sahara issue was raised at the 16th meeting of the Fourth Committee. The Cuban Representative introduced the draft resolution that was cosponsored by 43 other countries and after oral revision, was adopted without a vote on October 25.

The draft resolution, *inter alia,* welcomed the efforts and progress of the current OAU Chairman and the UN Secretary General in promoting a solution to the question of Western Sahara; noted the establishment of a technical commission to assist with resolving the question; and welcomed talks between King Hassan II of Morocco and a high-level POLISARIO Front delegation.

On December 11, the General Assembly adopted the Cuban resolution without a vote. (Resolution 44/88.)

NEW CALEDONIA

On December 11 the 44th General Assembly adopted a consensus resolution (Resolution 44/89) on New Caledonia for the second year in a row. As in 1988, the 1989 resolution avoided criticism of French policy of previous years.

The New Caledonia resolution was considered by the C–24 during four meetings held August 7–15. It was adopted by consensus in the Fourth Committee on October 25. The resolution noted the positive measures being pursued in New Caledonia by France to promote political, economic and social development, urged all parties there to refrain from violence and invited all parties to promote a framework for progress toward an act of self-determination.

New Caledonia is a French overseas territory located in the Pacific Ocean and has a population of about 152,000. It was acquired by France in 1853. New Caledonia was inscribed on the original list of non-self-governing territories in 1946, following transmission by the French Government of information on the territory pursuant to Article 73(e) of the UN Charter. Beginning in 1947, however, France declined to provide further information to the United Nations regarding New Caledonia.

OTHER QUESTIONS

Fourth Committee Resolutions

The Fourth Committee considered its agenda items in one month, virtually completing its work on October 25 by taking action on 19 draft resolutions and decisions. The Committee adopted a resolution on reporting information on non-self-governing territories by a vote of 140 to 0, with 3 abstentions (U.S.). A resolution dealing with the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 134 to 2 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. In addition to the resolutions on the Western Sahara and New Caledonia mentioned previously, resolutions and decisions dealing with 12 other territories, including American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as with the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa, and with offers by member states of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories, were passed without a vote. Although the United States participated in consensus on the three U.S. territory resolutions, it gave an explanation of vote expressing U.S. dissatisfaction with implications and assumptions contained in the resolutions. The decision on St. Helena was adopted by a vote of 108 to 2 (U.S), with 27 abstentions. The United States voted against the decision due to a critical reference in the resolution to military facilities on Ascension Island.

The Fourth Committee also considered the agenda item titled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration and Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in Southern Africa." On October 10 the Fourth Committee adopted a resolution on "foreign economic activities" by a vote of 84 to 10 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions and a decision on "military activities and arrangements by colonial powers in territories" by a vote of 86 to 12 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions.

The United States has consistently voted against Fourth Committee resolutions dealing with "foreign economic activities" because these resolutions make outmoded and erroneous assumptions with regard to the activities of multinational corporations. In addition, the U.S. Government does not view the activities of foreign economic entities as significant impediments to self-determination. The United States opposed the decision on military activities because the United States does not view the presence of military facilities and personnel in a non-self-governing territory as necessarily posing a major impediment to the exercise of self-determination by the people there.

Continuing the Committee's practice of the past 5 years, the United States was not singled out for condemnation in any of these C–24 drafted resolutions.

Plenary Action

On December 11 the General Assembly adopted all resolutions and decisions referred by the Fourth Committee, as well as three resolutions and one decision brought directly to plenary. The resolution on "foreign economic interests" (Resolution 44/84) was approved by a vote of 125 to 10 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions and the decision on "military activities" by a margin of 125 to 12 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions. (Decision 44/425.) The resolution on "information from non-self governing territories" was adopted by a vote of 154 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 44/83.) The resolution on the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 142 to 2 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 44/85.) The plenary adopted, without a vote, the same 16 draft resolutions and decisions that the Fourth Committee had earlier adopted without a vote. The decision on St. Helena was passed by a vote of 122 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. (Decision 44/428.)

The plenary adopted the omnibus resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by a vote of 142 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 44/101.) The United States opposed this resolution because it contained general condemnation of foreign economic activities and called for the withdrawal of foreign military installations from non-self-governing territories. The plenary also approved a resolution on the dissemination of information on decolonization by a margin of 143 to 2 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions (Resolution 44/102), and adopted a resolution containing a program of activities to mark the 30th anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence of Colonial Countries and Peoples by a vote of 137 to 2 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 44/100.) The United States opposed these resolutions for budgetary reasons. A decision on the Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism was adopted by a vote of 130 to 0, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). (Decision 44/429.) The United States abstained because colonialism is well on the way to being eradicated, making the decision's request for suggestions on an action plan to eradicate colonialism by the 21st century unnecessary.

Part 4

Legal Developments

INTRODUCTION

Significant legal issues of both substantive and procedural varieties arise frequently in connection with U.S. participation in UN activities and in activities of international organizations affiliated with the United Nations. Many of these legal matters are discussed in other parts of this report in the context of the underlying issues or particular international organizations to which they relate; including review of the UN Charter, uses of outer space, international human rights, the International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization and UNESCO matters, UN administration and budget and UN trusteeship issues. Part 4, therefore, deals separately with 1989 activities of an exclusively legal character, such as those of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and special international conferences or committees that consider legal questions involving the drafting of certain treaties or the relations between the United States in its capacity as the host country for UN Headquarters and for missions to the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The General Assembly considers on a biennial basis an item entitled "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of the underlying cause of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical change." This item was on the agenda of the 44th session of the General Assembly and was considered in the Sixth Committee on October 12 and 16–19.

Debate focused on condemnation of terrorist acts, measures for combatting terrorism, the need for increased cooperation in fighting terrorism, praise for international instruments and the work of ICAO and IMO in the area of terrorism, the causes of terrorism and the need to distinguish terrorism from national liberation. In addition, many delegations addressed so-called state terrorism, the growing threat of narco-terrorism, and a Syrian proposal to convene an international conference to define terrorism and differentiate it from national liberation. In his statement before the Sixth Committee, U.S. Representative Robert Rosenstock spoke of the universality of terrorism and the threat it poses to international stability. He called on the Committee to restore the consensus on the terrorism item which had been disrupted at the 42nd session and to avoid the distraction of focusing on the causes of terrorism, national liberation movements and the use of force by states. Mr. Rosenstock also emphasized that some acts are so heinous they can never be justified by any motivation, including the struggle for national liberation.

The Sixth Committee had before it two draft resolutions on this agenda item, one cosponsored by several Western countries and the other sponsored by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Following extensive negotiations, a common text emerged which the General assembly adopted without a vote at its 72nd meeting on December 4. Resolution 44/29, as finally adopted, *inter alia*, condemns as criminal and unjustifiable all acts of terrorism, urges states to fulfill their obligations under international law and to take effective measures to eliminate terrorism, calls for the immediate and safe release of all hostages, expresses concern over the growing link between drug-trafficking and terrorism and urges ICAO to intensify its work on a regime for the marking of plastic explosives for the purposes of detection.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court's main functions are to decide cases submitted to it by states and to give advisory opinions on legal questions at the request of international organizations authorized to request such opinions pursuant to the Statute of the Court and the UN Charter.

The Court is composed of 15 judges, no 2 of whom may be nationals of the same state. The UN General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently, elect the judges from a list of persons nominated by national groups on the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The electors are mandated to bear in mind the qualifications of the individual candidates and the need for the Court as a whole to represent the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world. Court members are elected for 9-year terms, with one third of the total number of judges elected every 3 years.

On December 11, 1988, Judge Nagendra Singh, President of the Court from 1985 to 1988, died. On April 18, 1989, the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations elected Mr. Raghunandan Swarup Pathak to fill the remainder of Judge Singh's term extending to February 5, 1991.

The Court submitted to the 44th General Assembly a brief report on its activities from August 1, 1988, to July 31, 1989. The report contained information on the Court's composition, jurisdiction, judicial work, administration and publications. The General Assembly took note of the report on November 1. (Decision 44/405.)

Nicaragua v. United States of America

The United States continued to maintain that the Court's decision that it had jurisdiction in this case was "clearly and manifestly erroneous as to both fact and law" and that the Court was without jurisdiction to hear the dispute.

Mazilu Case

On May 24 the Economic and Social Council passed a resolution (1989/75) requesting the Court to render an Advisory Opinion on the Legal Question of the Applicability of Article VI, Section 22 of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations in the Case of Mr. Dumitru Mazilu as special rapporteur of the Subcommission. The dispute involved the refusal of the Romanian Government to allow Mr. Mazilu to perform the functions of an expert appointed by the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, a subsidiary organ of the Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Mazilu had been appointed as a special rapporteur by the Sub-Commission to prepare a report on human rights and youth. The Romanian Government denied repeated requests by the Sub-Commission and ECOSOC to allow Mr. Mazilu to perform this function, frustrating efforts by the UN officials to bring Mr. Mazilu to Geneva to complete his report or even to make contact with Mr. Mazilu. The Secretary General through his Legal Counsel, Carl Fleischhauer, filed a written statement and made an oral presentation asserting that Article VI, Section 22 of the UN Convention, regarding the privileges and immunities to be accorded experts of the United Nations, applied in this particular instance. The United States submitted extensive written statements and made an oral statement generally supporting the views of the Secretary General regarding the construction of the convention (but providing more detail regarding the scope of the subject provisions than contained in the statements presented by the Secretary-General).

On December 15 the Court rendered its opinion unanimously holding that Article VI, Section 22 of the convention was applicable in the case of Mr. Mazilu.

Iran v. United States of America

On May 17 Iran filed an Application in the Court instituting proceedings against the United States regarding the shooting down of a civilian Iranian airliner by U.S. military forces protecting U.S. merchant vessels in the Persian Gulf during the hostilities between Iran and Iraq. By order of December 13, 1989, the Court provided that Iran file its Memorial by June 12, 1990, and the United States to file its Counter-Memorial by December 10, 1990.

INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 174(II) of November 21, 1947, the International Law Commission (ILC) was established in 1948 to promote the codification and progressive development of international law. The membership, which was increased from 25 to 34 during the 36th General Assembly, consists of legal experts serving in their individual capacities and elected by the General Assembly for 5-year terms. Stephen Conolley McCaffrey of the United States was elected on November 23, 1981, for a term which began on January 1, 1982, and reelected by the General Assembly on November 14, 1986.

The Commission studies topics it has determined are suitable for codification, or that other UN bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. Its normal procedure is to select one of its members (designated a "special rapporteur") to prepare reports on each of the topics and, after discussion, to draft articles which are acted on by the full Commission. Each year, the Commission reports to the General Assembly on the articles it has adopted during that year's session. It reconsiders the articles in light of government comments, and then adopts final texts which it forwards to the General Assembly. When the Assembly receives a set of draft articles, generally in the form of a proposed convention, it may convene a diplomatic conference to consider adoption of a convention, review the articles itself, note them, or remand them to the Commission for further study.

Work of the Commission's 41st Session

The ILC held its 41st session in Geneva from May 2 to July 21. It elected Mr. Bernhard Graefrath as its chairman.

The Commission had on its agenda seven substantive topics: state responsibility; jurisdictional immunities of states and their property; status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier; draft code of crimes against the peace and security of mankind; the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses; international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law; and relations between states and international organizations (second part of the topic).

The Commission considered all the topics on its agenda although that dealing with relations between states and international organizations received only minimal consideration. The Commission took the following actions on its topics:

— **Status of the Diplomatic Courier and Bag.** The Commission completed the second, and final, reading of the draft articles on the diplomatic bag. In its report to the General Assembly, the Commission recommended that a diplomatic conference be called to consider adoption of a convention on the subject.

— **Draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Mankind.** The Commission devoted eleven meetings to this topic. It considered two draft articles ("War crimes" and "Crimes against humanity") contained in the special rapporteur's report and referred both articles to the drafting committee. The Commission also provisionally adopted three draft articles ("Threat of aggression," "Intervention" and "Colonial domination and other forms of alien domination").

— **State Responsibility.** The Commission devoted seven meetings to the topic of state responsibility. The Commission considered a preliminary report from the special rapporteur which contained two draft articles ("Cessation of an internationally wrongful act of a continuing character" and "Restitution in kind") and referred both draft articles to the drafting committee.

— **International Liability.** The Commission devoted eight meetings to the topic of international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law. The Commission discussed the report of the special rapporteur which contained 17 draft articles, the first 9 of which the Commission referred to the drafting committee.

— **Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property.** The Commission devoted nine meetings to this topic. It discussed the draft articles previously adopted on first reading and two reports submitted by the special rapporteur, which contained an analytical survey of the comments and observations of Governments on the draft articles and revised texts prepared by the special rapporteur. The Commission referred draft articles 1 to 11 to the drafting committee and agreed to examine articles 12 to 28 at the beginning of its next session.

— **Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses.** The Commission devoted five meetings to this topic, during which it discussed two draft articles contained in the special rapporteur's fifth report. Two other draft articles contained in the report were not discussed due to lack of time.

— **Relations Between States and International Organizations.** The Commission devoted one meeting to this topic. The Commission heard a presentation by the special rapporteur of his fourth report, which contained 11 draft articles. The report was not discussed for lack of time.

General Assembly Action

The Sixth Committee approved a resolution on the Commission's report which recommended, *inter alia*, that the Commission should continue its work on all the topics on its agenda, with the exception of that pertaining to the status of the diplomatic courier and bag. The Committee approved the resolution by consensus and forwarded it to the General Assembly, which adopted it on December 4, also by consensus. (Resolution 43/169.)

UN COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

The UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), established by the General Assembly in 1966, has as its principal mandate the progressive codification of international trade law. The General Assembly in its resolution 44/33 (December 1989) reaffirmed that UNCITRAL is the "core legal body" for this purpose within the United Nations. The Commission at its 22nd plenary session in May 1989 and in the meetings of its specialized working groups continued to conduct its work in a nonpoliticized and technically oriented manner, without North-South or East-West divisions impairing the effectiveness of its work. The Commission is composed of 36 member states elected by the General Assembly for a term of 6 years.* Additional states and international organizations participate as observers in the work of the Commission. The technical focus of the Commission is enhanced by its tradition of working by consensus rather than voting, avoiding regional and bloc positions on substantive matters and by fully considering the views of observer states, thereby lessening the political implications of membership.

International Law Conventions

DRAFT UN CONVENTION ON TRANSPORT TERMINALS

The Commission completed its work on a draft Convention on the Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals in International Trade, which had been in progress since 1984. The operation of transport terminals is an important link in the international carriage of goods, and is the point at which air, sea and land transport systems are interconnected. The draft convention is designed to

---

*Members in 1989 were Argentina, Bulgaria**, Cameroon**, Canada**, Chile, China**, Costa Rica**, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark**, Egypt**, France**, Federal Republic of Germany**, Hungary, India, Iran**, Iraq, Italy, Japan**, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Mexico**, Morocco**, Netherlands, Nigeria**, Sierra Leone, Singapore**, Spain, Togo**, Soviet Union**, Great Britain**, United States, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

("**") denotes states whose 6-year term began in 1989. Members are nominated by regional consensus; Permanent Members of the Security Council are by tradition reelected upon expiration of their terms.

provide a uniform system of rights applicable to transport terminals, where these rights are not otherwise covered by existing carriage of goods treaties or conventions. The General Assembly in December 1989 approved resolution A/44/33, with U.S. support, authorizing a diplomatic conference to be held in Vienna in 1991 for states to consider adoption of the convention and opening it for signature and ratification.

The Commission devoted most of its 22nd plenary session, held at Vienna, Austria, in May 1989, to the completion of its work on this convention. The principal compromises achieved by the U.S. Delegation concerned the application of the convention to cargo handlers and their right, with respect to performance, to optionally apply the terms of maritime bills of lading. Major issues for the United States remaining for the diplomatic conference include the convention's scope and its relation to other international transportation conventions, and the legal treatment of containerized shipments. The draft text of the convention and summaries of the Commission's deliberations are contained in the Commission's report of its 22nd session (A/44/17).

UN CONVENTION ON CONTRACTS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SALES OF GOODS

In 1988 the United States, along with 10 other states, became a party to this UNCITRAL-prepared convention, the first such multilateral treaty on substantive international commercial law to which the United States has become a party. The United States has encouraged other states to join the convention in order to establish a widespread network of countries linked to a common international law standard in this area. Six more states became parties in 1989, continuing a broad geographic membership: Australia, Austria, Finland, Mexico, Norway and Sweden. In addition, four more states, the Byelorussian S.S.R., Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic in 1989 deposited their accessions to the convention and will become parties at a subsequent time.

UNCITRAL's 1989 Work Program

The Commission completed its work on the draft convention on transport terminal operators, continued its work on model laws on procurement and on international credit transfers, and decided to initiate work on two additional projects—a draft uniform law on international guarantees and standby letters of credit, and a legal guide on international countertrade contracts. The Commission's three working groups are composed of all its member states, together with other UN states and international organizations attending as observers.

MODEL LAW ON PROCUREMENT

The Commission reviewed the progress of its working group, which had considered both the outline of a model law and issues common to existing major international and domestic procurement systems (A/CN.9/315). The United States expressed satisfaction at the progress made, noting that public agency-related acquisitions made up a significant proportion of major purchases in developing states, and that establishing international norms for procurement through UNCITRAL would facilitate trade as well as promote harmonization of national laws. The Commission, noting that the scope of the GATT Agreement on Government Procurement was being broadened, concluded that UNCITRAL's work involved a wider range of states and would cover legal aspects of procurement in substantially greater detail. Major issues for the United States at this stage were the scope of the model law, emphasis on regulated tender and award procedures, "transparency" of applicable national regulations, the inclusion of services as well as goods, and remedies.

MODEL LAW ON INTERNATIONAL CREDIT TRANSFERS

The Commission's Working Group on International Payments held two 2-week meetings during 1989 to review a draft model law prepared by the Secretariat. The working group decided that the draft model law would cover only "international" segments of funds transfers and would include paper-based as well as electronic transfers, both of which decisions were opposed by the United States. The U.S. Delegation expressed concern that the draft law needed significant revision in order to be compatible with newer funds transfer law and practices in the United States that were based on computer-assisted high volume and high speed systems (A/CN.9/318).

MODEL LAW ON INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEES AND STANDBY LETTERS OF CREDIT

The Commission at its 22nd plenary session approved, with the support of the United States, the report of its Working Group on International Contract Practices, which had proposed changes to draft rules on international guarantees prepared by the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC). The Commission at the same time authorized the working group to prepare a draft model law on guarantees and standby letters of credit (A/CN.9/WG.II/WP.65). It was concluded, with U.S. support, that development of a uniform law for national statutory adoption would complement and not overlap the ICC's work, which was in the form of contract rules to be adopted by party consent.

LEGAL GUIDE FOR INTERNATIONAL COUNTERTRADE CONTRACTS

The Commission at its 22nd plenary session approved a draft outline of a legal guide for drawing up countertrade contracts, and authorized the Secretariat to begin preparation of draft chapters for the Commission's review (A/CN.9/322). It was noted that while some states, including the United States, were concerned that countertrade practices could inhibit the growth of multilateral free trade, many states were engaging in such practices because of foreign currency and international credit limitations. The draft outline contemplates a technical consideration of issues, without indicating support for any particular form of trade practice. It was also noted that the Commission was a specialized UN legal body that included countries at all stages of economic development, and would thus not duplicate work on countertrade guidelines under way in the Economic Commission for Europe.

COORDINATION OF WORK BY INTERNATIONAL BODIES

The Commission reviewed a Secretariat report (A/CN.9/324) on the work of approximately 20 international organizations, both governmental and nongovernmental, in the areas of international commercial contracts, international payments, transport and carriage of goods by sea, international commercial arbitration, trade documentation, commodities, transnational corporations, transfer of technology, industrial and intellectual property law and related trade law subjects. The report was prepared in light of the General Assembly's mandate to UNCITRAL to promote coordination in such work.

DRAFT CODE OF OFFENSES AGAINST THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF MANKIND

The General Assembly has been considering this item periodically since 1947 without definitive result. The original impetus for the exercise was an inclination, building on the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, to draft highly detailed rules, violation of which would constitute criminal behavior. Initial efforts resulted in a draft by the International Law Commission that did not command sufficient support for final action to be taken. After a hiatus of 20 years, during which the Assembly dealt in other forms with much of the conduct in question, resulting in such instruments as the Genocide Convention and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Assembly resumed consideration of this item at its 33rd session in 1978.

In the course of the Assembly's consideration of the item in 1978, and from 1980-1985 and in written comments, the United States along with most of the Western European countries welcomed the decision of the International Law Commission to limit its consideration at this stage to responsibility of individuals rather than states but expressed great doubt that any useful progress could be made, since, *inter alia,* the project exceeded the clear basis of universal agreement and the issues involved are inextricably linked to the mechanism of international criminal jurisdiction on which progress is most unlikely. Western countries also noted the extent to which much of the original material had in fact been dealt with elsewhere in the interim. Support for the item from some non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union has, however, been sufficient to keep it before the United Nations.

The Sixth Committee considered the item at meetings in October and November. During debate in the Sixth Committee, U.S. Adviser Christine Cervenak criticized the priority treatment accorded by the Commission to this topic given the lack of consensus on the topic in the Sixth Committee. Ms. Cervenak also requested the Chairman of the Commission to confirm that the Draft Code would focus on criminal responsibility of individuals as opposed to states, criticized the draft articles for their vagueness and expressed the need for the Commission to address the question of an appropriate implementation mechanism.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/32 on this item by a vote of 133 to 5 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The resolution invited the International Law Commission to continue its work on the elaboration of the Draft Code and decided to include the item in the provisional agenda of the 45th General Assembly. The United States, joined by France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United Kingdom, voted against the resolution on the ground that it disapproved of treating the Draft Code as a separate agenda item or otherwise according it priority treatment.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST MERCENARY ACTIVITIES

In resolution 35/48, the General Assembly established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. The *Ad Hoc* Committee was to be composed of 35 member states but was later reduced in size to 34.* At its first session in 1981, the Committee discussed the various issues that must be resolved before an international convention against mercenary activities can be concluded.

During its 1982 session, the Committee had before it draft conventions prepared by Nigeria and France, comments from several member states and a compilation of international agreements and national legislation relating to mercenary activities. In addition to discussing the draft articles of the Nigerian and French texts and related proposals from other member states, the Committee formed two working groups that used most of the time allocated to the Committee for its 1982 session. Working Group A dealt with issues of definition and the scope of the future convention, and Working Group B addressed all other issues relevant to it. Both working groups succeeded in clarifying, and thus simplifying, a number of issues, although some critical ones such as the definition of the term "mercenary" were not resolved. This work was continued during the 1983, 1984 and 1985 sessions. No 1986 session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was held as a result of the UN financial situation. Negotiations resumed in 1987.

---

*Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Seychelles, Spain, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

In 1989 the *Ad Hoc* Committee met twice, first during a 3-week session in January and again during the autumn session of the General Assembly. By the end of its second meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Committee had reached agreement on a complete text of the Convention, including a preamble and final clauses. The *Ad Hoc* Committee transmitted this completed text to the Sixth Committee for consideration, which approved the text by consensus.

On December 4, the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/34 without a vote, by which it opened the convention for signature and ratification or for accession. The text of the convention, formally titled the International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, is included as an annex to this resolution.

The convention establishes a narrowly-drawn definition of "mercenary" that generally adheres to the definition of that term contained in Article 47, paragraph 2 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. As its title implies, the convention prohibits states parties from recruiting, using, financing or training mercenaries. It also requires states parties either to prosecute or to extradite individuals found in its territories who are alleged to have committed acts set forth in the convention.

PEACE, SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

At a November 3 press conference, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs John Bolton and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovsky announced that the two countries would jointly sponsor a resolution on peace, security and international cooperation. In a joint statement, they noted that the two countries have been working together on a draft to underline the two countries' intention to cooperate in improving the effectiveness of the United Nations. An explanatory memorandum they submitted noted that, in light of recent developments, there are renewed prospects for international cooperation towards common goals. The document also stated that it is clear that the international community increasingly wishes constructive international relations based on cooperation and coordinated action in its task of preserving international peace and security, as noted in the 1989 report of the UN Secretary General on the work of the organization.

The resolution, entitled "Enhancing international peace, security and international cooperation in all its aspects in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations," was the first resolution jointly presented by the United States and U.S.S.R. to the General Assembly. It called upon all states to intensify their practical efforts towards ensuring international peace and security in all its aspects through cooperative means in accordance with the

Charter. Moreover, it reaffirmed support for the validity of the Charter, urged all states to abide by it, to respect such principles as sovereign equality, political independence and territorial integrity of states, nonintervention in internal affairs, peacefully settle disputes, adhere to the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and comply in good faith with their obligations assumed in accordance with the Charter. Finally, it encouraged member states to cooperate within the UN system to find multifaceted approaches to implement and strengthen the system of peace, security and international cooperation laid down in the UN Charter.

The resolution was approved without a vote in the UN General Assembly plenary on November 15. (Resolution 44/21.)

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

In 1969 the Soviet Union proposed an agenda item for the General Assembly on the "Strengthening of international security." The Assembly adopted a Soviet-sponsored declaration on this topic in 1970 which touched on the full range of UN activity, including peaceful settlement of disputes, strengthening peacekeeping procedures, disarmament, colonialism, racial discrimination, self-determination and closing the economic gap between developed and developing countries. Resolutions calling for implementation of this declaration have been considered annually by the General Assembly since 1971. Although the United States voted in favor of the initial declaration, it has often abstained or voted against subsequent resolutions under this agenda item on the grounds that they contribute little to promoting peace and respect for the principles of the UN Charter. Moreover, some of these resolutions on strengthening international security have contained formulations unacceptable to the United States.

In recent years the non-aligned countries have used this agenda item as a vehicle to promote tenets of non-aligned doctrine such as anticolonialism, the New International Economic Order, support for national liberation movements and national sovereignty over natural resources. Three draft resolutions were introduced and considered by the First Committee during the period November 23–30 under the agenda item, "Strengthening International Security" (SIS).

On October 27 Cameroon submitted a draft resolution entitled "Establishment of the Office of the Director General for International Peace and Security." The draft would have established this new office to give "effective leadership to the various components of the UN system" in peacekeeping arrangements and a "constant and comprehensive policy review of international peace and security operational activities." It invited the Secretary General to appoint a Director General for a 4-year term, beginning in the first quarter of 1990. A revised version of the draft was tabled on November 13.

On November 29, however, after consultations with other delegations, the sponsor withdrew the draft without seeking a vote.

On November 28 Yugoslavia submitted its traditional draft resolution, along with 10 non-aligned cosponsors, entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (SIS)." A revised version submitted November 29 was approved by the First Committee on November 30 by a vote of 98 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions, and on December 15 by the plenary, by a vote of 128 to 1 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. (Resolution 44/126.) The text contained the full range of non-aligned views ranging from implementing the recommendations of the final document of the first special session on disarmament to the assertion that the "gradual military disengagement of the great powers and their military alliances from various parts of the world should be promoted," and that the "economic situation in the vast majority of the developing countries has deteriorated dramatically." *Inter alia*, the resolution noted with concern that the provisions of the SIS Declaration of 1970 had not been fully implemented and urged all states to abide strictly by their obligations under the UN Charter. It called on states to "refrain from the use or threat of use of force, intervention, interference, aggression, foreign occupation and colonial domination or . . . coercion which violate the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of other states, as well as the permanent sovereignty of peoples over their natural resources." It "reaffirmed the legitimacy" of the "struggle of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence."

Until 1986 the United States had abstained on this resolution. At the 44th Assembly, however, as during the previous three sessions, the United States judged that it was compelled to oppose the increasingly objectionable language which has come to dominate the text, and therefore voted against the resolution. Among the extraneous and tendentious formulations in the Yugoslav resolution to which the United States took particular exception were: the implication that the superpowers are primarily responsible for a deteriorating international security climate, the suggestion that the nuclear arms race is being extended into outer space, the linking of disarmament and development, the assertion that the United Nations is an "indispensable forum for negotiations" and the call for unqualified support of national liberation movements. The United States found the 1989 version to still be objectionable. In an explanation of vote delivered November 30, U.S. Representative Laura Clerici stated :

> The United States believes that this resolution inadequately takes into account the far-reaching changes that have taken place in the international sphere in recent years, changes which have not been limited to one region nor have they taken place on a single level of international relations . . .
>
> There are several inaccuracies in this text. For instance, the language in the sixth paragraph of the preamble suggests that the INF Treaty would lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The INF Treaty nowhere creates such an expectation;

> rather, it talks about the strengthening of strategic stability, a concept which assumes the continued existence of nuclear deterrence. Misleading references, intentional or otherwise, to important arms control treaties do a disservice to the entire arms control effort.
>
> The developing world suffers from very real economic problems; however, these problems deserve to be treated as serious economic issues, not security issues of dubious legitimacy. Moreover, there is the real danger that mixing economic and strategic metaphors will only divert us from the search for viable solutions to both of these vital areas.
>
> Likewise, the United States does not accept the presumed link between disarmament and development assistance as stated in the seventh preambular paragraph. Disarmament and development are distinct issues which should be considered on their own merits . . . .

Malta introduced on November 28 its traditional SIS resolution in the First Committee on the "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region." The text expressed concern over "continuing military operations and reports of recent activities in the Mediterranean and the danger they create for peace, security and general equilibrium in the region." It reaffirmed that security in the region is closely linked with European security. The resolution emphasized the need to reduce tensions and called for just and viable solutions for existing problems and crises in the region in accordance with the UN Charter and "the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation and the right of peoples under colonial or foreign domination to self-determination and independence." It also urged all states to cooperate with Mediterranean states to reduce tensions and promote peace, security and cooperation in the region.

As in previous years, the Mediterranean SIS resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 30. The plenary likewise adopted it by consensus on December 15. (Resolution 44/125.)

HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS

The General Assembly established the Committee on Relations with the Host Country* in 1971 to replace the informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations. The Committee deals with the security of UN missions and safety of personnel, diplomatic privileges and immunities, tax problems, financial indebtedness of UN missions and their personnel, visa matters and other issues relating to the implementation of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States.**

The Committee met five times during 1989: March 7, May 25, October 27, November 3 and November 10.

---

*The Committee's membership for 1989 was as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cyrpus, France, Honduras, Iraq, Mali, Senegal, Spain, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States.

**Agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. (Resolution 169(II), October 31, 1947.)

On December 4 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 44/38 which approved the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. The resolution endorsed the recommendations and conclusions of the Committee contained in its report, reflected the positive atmosphere of the work of the Committee, and reiterated the Committee's appreciation

> . . . to the Host Country Section of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, the New York City Commission for the United Nations and the Consular Corps and those bodies, particularly the New York City Police Department, which contribute to its efforts to help to accommodate the needs, interests and requirements of the diplomatic community, to provide hospitality and to promote mutual understanding between the diplomatic community and the people of the City of New York.

While criticism of the United States as host country was generally muted, the resolution drew attention to two long-standing sources of irritation with the host country: travel restrictions imposed by the United States on personnel of certain missions and staff members of the Secretariat of certain nationalities and measures relating to diplomatic vehicles, e.g., towing and traffic citations.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The Sixth Committee of the 44th General Assembly again considered the item "Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order" (NIEO). On November 20, the Sixth Committee adopted a resolution that, *inter alia:*

> Recommends that the Sixth Committee should consider making a final decision at the 46th session of the General Assembly on the question of the appropriate forum within its framework which would undertake the task of completing the elaboration of the process of codification and progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order, taking into account the proposals and suggestions which have been or will be submitted by member states on the matter.

The United States abstained on this resolution in the Sixth Committee. In its explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative stated that we did not endorse further UN activity on this item and that we viewed the NIEO as such to be an out-moded economic concept which does not enjoy widespread support in either the developed or developing world. He further explained that, under these circumstances, we did not consider that the identification of a forum in which to discuss the legal norms affecting the NIEO to be an appropriate undertaking.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution (Resolution 44/30) on December 4 by a vote of 127 to 0, with 25 abstentions (U.S.).

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

At the request of Trinidad and Tobago, a new item was added to the agenda of the 44th session of the General Assembly entitled "International criminal responsibility of individuals and entities engaged in illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs and across national frontiers and other transnational criminal activities: establishment of an international criminal court with jurisdiction over such crimes."

The Sixth Committee considered the item in November. During the debate, U.S. Adviser Jason Abrams acknowledged the potential benefits which the establishment of an international criminal court might bring, but remarked that the United States perceived many questions concerning the usefulness and feasibility of such a court which needed to be examined. Among these questions were whether a sufficient number of states would ever accept such a court, whether states would be more willing to hand an offender over to an international court than they would be to prosecute the individual or to extradite them to another state, whether an international criminal court would glamorize international crimes and numerous complex questions of a practical nature. Mr. Abrams explained that, in light of these questions and complexities, the issue should be referred to the International Law Commission for study.

On December 4 the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/39 without a vote. The resolution requested the International Law Commission to address the question of establishing an international criminal court in conjunction with its consideration of the Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind, and inscribed the question of establishing such a court on the agenda of the 45th General Assembly.

DRAFT ARTICLES ON THE DIPLOMATIC COURIER AND BAG

The International Law Commission began consideration of this topic at its 29th session in 1977. At its 41st session in 1989, the Commission completed its second, and final, reading of the draft articles and recommended to the General Assembly that a diplomatic conference be called to consider adoption of a convention on the subject.

The Sixth Committee considered this topic in October and November. In his remarks before the Sixth Committee, U.S. Representative Robert Rosenstock urged caution in considering the Commission's proposal for a diplomatic conference in light of the costs of and alternatives to such a conference and questioned whether a conference is the appropriate next stage. Mr. Rosenstock drew attention to the value of the existing regime governing the diplomatic courier and bag, and questioned the necessity and desirability of creating another regime. Finally, Mr. Rosenstock also pointed out that the General Assembly had not been given enough time to consider the Commission's report and recommended that action on the draft articles be deferred until the 45th General Assembly.

On December 4 the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/36 on this topic without a vote. The resolution called for the holding of informal consultations at the 45th General Assembly to study the draft articles and the question of how to deal further with them, with a view to facilitating the reaching of a "generally acceptable decision" on the latter issue. In an explanation of vote in the Sixth Committee, Mr. Rosenstock had stated that while the United States would join consensus on the resolution, it considered the resolution to be inappropriate, because it attempted to make a decision for the 45th General Assembly and, in any event, there was little purpose in holding consultations until it was decided what, if any, would be the next step on the topic.

UN DECADE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

On November 17 the General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution (44/23) declaring the period 1990–1999 as the UN Decade of International Law. The resolution expresses the views of the General Assembly that the main purposes of the decade should be, *inter alia,* to promote the acceptance and respect of international law; to promote means and methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes and to encourage the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to seek the views of member states and appropriate international bodies as well as nongovernmental organizations working in the field on the program for the decade and on appropriate action to be taken during the decade and to report to the Assembly at its 45th session. The Assembly decided to consider this question at its 45th session in a working group of the Sixth Committee with a view to preparing acceptable recommendations for the decade and to include the item in the provisional agenda of the 45th session.

The Permanent Representative of the United States, Ambassador Thomas R. Pickering, made a statement in plenary session of the General Assembly supporting the initiative but urging the Assembly not to lose sight of the fact that the proliferation of decades devoted to worthy causes must be kept within bound. Ambassador Pickering also emphasized the importance of consensus, generally in the work of the United Nations, and particularly, in the field of international law.

Part 5

Budget, Administration and Institutional Management

INTRODUCTION

U.S. efforts in 1989 regarding UN budget, administration and institutional management issues were capped by the December 21 decision of the UN General Assembly to approve the UN Program Budget for the 1990–1991 biennium. (Resolution 44/202.) This consensus approval, as explained below, marked the successful completion of the first full UN program budget cycle under the terms of the budget reforms established in General Assembly resolution 41/213 in 1986. Successful implementation of consensus budget reforms was achieved also in the other major UN specialized agencies (WHO, ILO, UNIDO, ICAO and WMO) except for the FAO for which a program budget for 1990–1991 was approved over the opposition of the United States and other major donors.

President Reagan's FY 1990 budget request, issued in January 1989, provided for essentially full funding of U.S. assessed contributions in 1989 and for the first payments in a 6-year plan to eliminate U.S. arrearages to the United Nations and other international organizations. President Bush reaffirmed this request for essentially full funding and arrearage payments in his own FY 1990 budget request.

Primarily reflecting overriding concerns with the Federal deficit, rather than substantive policy objections regarding international organizations, FY 1990 appropriations by Congress were delayed and below the level requested. Because of the reduced levels of funding available, and the fact that the State Department authorization bill was not yet enacted, Presidential determinations specified in the revised Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment (see last year's report) were not required for payments made in 1989. Nevertheless, the Administration believed that such determinations would have been justified for all organizations except the FAO, and Congressional consultations were conducted before 1989 payments were made.

Two additional matters for 1989 in the area of UN budget, administration and institutional management should be highlighted. As explained below, the General Assembly approved by consensus assessments for funding new UN peacekeeping forces in Namibia and Angola (UNTAG and UNAVEM) early in the year and for UN observer forces in Central America (ONUCA) late in the year. The other matter of major importance was consensus approval by the General Assembly for a pay increase for professional staff members of the UN common system. This decision was of major importance for the UN system as a whole. The United States and other major donors played a significant role in achieving modifications of the original proposal in order to make it acceptable.

The work of the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) is related to the work of all other main UN committees. It deals with organization-wide administrative problems, such as conference scheduling personnel issues and the coordination of activities among various UN organizations. Before the General Assembly votes on any resolution having financial implications, the Fifth Committee must provide information on how the resolution, if adopted, will affect the UN budget. In its most important role, the Fifth Committee makes recommendations to the General Assembly on the regular program budget and on assessed peacekeeping budgets.

Several special UN bodies, some consisting of experts serving in their personal capacities and some of an intergovernmental nature, assist in this work. In financial matters, the best known of the expert committees are the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Committee on Contributions. The ACABQ examines the Secretary General's proposals and reports to the General Assembly on the UN budgets and UN accounts, on the administrative budgets of the UN specialized agencies and on other administrative, financial and budgetary matters referred to it. The Committee on Contributions advises the General Assembly on all questions relating to the apportionment of UN expenses among UN members. Other expert financial bodies are the Board of Auditors, the Investment Committee (which advises on the management of the Pension Fund) and the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), composed of experts in the personnel field, makes recommendations to the General Assembly for the regulation and coordination of conditions of service within the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other international organizations that participate in the UN common system of salaries and allowances. The Committee on Conferences is an intergovernmental, administrative body, which seeks to develop a workable calendar of UN meetings and advises the Assembly on the most efficient use of conference resources and on current and future requirements.

A senior executive committee, an intergovernmental body, and an expert group have responsibilities ranging broadly across the work of the whole UN system of organizations. The Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) composed of the UN Secretary General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, the IAEA and other major bodies and programs meets regularly to supervise the implementation of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and to coordinate the activities of the various organizations. The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), an intergovernmental body, serves as the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming and coordination. In accord with resolution 41/213, as explained below, the CPC has assumed an additional key role in implementation of the new consensus-based budget process. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), a group of experts who serve full time, is empowered to investigate and evaluate any matter bearing on the efficiency of services and the proper use of funds.

Each of these bodies is concerned with some aspect of making the system work better. The highlights of their activities during 1989 are recounted in the sections that follow.

UN REFORM

On December 20 the Fifth Committee approved by consensus a draft resolution on the implementation of UN reforms adopted in 1986 under General Assembly resolution 41/213. The Fifth Committee draft resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 21, also by consensus, as resolution 44/200.

The issue of further staff reductions to meet the 15 percent target recommended in the report of the Group of 18 dominated informal consultations with developing countries generally opposing the efforts of developed countries to insert language concerning staff reductions. The developing country delegations argued that implementation of recommendation number 15 in the Group of 18 report was limited to a 3-year period ending in 1989. They believed they had tacit support from the Secretary General who, in proposing staff reductions amounting to 12 percent in the 1990–1991 UN program budget, had indicated that further cuts were not possible at this time. Developed country delegations, led by the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, insisted that the time frame implied in the Group of 18 report did not prevent member states from deciding to continue the staff reduction exercise.

In the end, agreement was reached on language which allows for consideration at the 45th meeting of the General Assembly of proposals the Secretary General may put forward for further reductions in Secretariat staff. Also agreed on by the Fifth Committee was a proposal advanced by the Delegate from the Soviet Union, which was supported in part by the Delegation from the United States, to strengthen the role of the Secretary General in the Administrative Committee on Coordination as well as a proposal calling for a review of the organizational arrangements for the ACC's Secretariat.

An effort by the Cuban and Venezuelan Delegations to increase the representation of developing and less developed countries on UN expert bodies in the administrative and budgetary areas was defeated in the face of strong opposition from the major contributing countries. The language in the draft resolution requests the Secretary General to provide, at the 45th General Assembly, a compendium of mandates of subsidiary administrative and budgetary bodies, information on internal reviews carried out by these bodies over the past 5 years, on the understanding that the decisions of the General Assembly relating to the mandates of these bodies remain valid. The agreed language, while maintaining the *status quo*, could set the stage for further confrontation between developed and developing countries in the Fifth Committee.

A section of the resolution addressed concerns regarding the format and methodology of the program budget and the budget outline. In particular, the resolution addressed issues raised by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Committee for Program and Coordination regarding the treatment of extrabudgetary resources and programs in the context of the assessed (regular) budget. Both bodies noted several examples in the 1990–1991 UN program budget where the distinction between assessed and voluntary funding of programs was unclear. Also, the resolution requested the Secretary General to extend progressively the provision of statements of program budget implications to all subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. As recommended by the ACABQ, consideration of the establishment of a reserve fund to cover inflation, statutory cost increases and currency fluctuations was deferred until the 46th session of the General Assembly.

The statement of the U.S. Delegation on the status of the implementation of UN reforms was made in conjunction with the separate agenda item covering the 1990–1991 UN program budget. The statement was delivered to the Fifth Committee on October 16 by Ambassador James Wilkinson. In commenting on the report of the Secretary General on the implementation of reforms called for under resolution 41/213, Ambassador Wilkinson noted,

> . . . my delegation agrees with the Secretary General that implementation of resolution 41/213 is not a finite process—indeed, rigorous reviews should be a normal part of any organization's operations and not limited to a particular resolution or mandate. We agree that 41/213 will continue to contribute to a more effective and efficient Secretariat. This is essential for the confidence of member states in the organization consistent with the original goals enumerated in the UN Charter.

He cautioned that, while progress on reforms had clearly been achieved, ". . . more needs to be done." In calling for continued action by the United Nations on implementation of reforms, Ambassador Wilkinson stated,

> . . . the Group of 18 established a 3-year timetable for implementation of its 71 recommendations. This deadline underscored the urgency of reform. The deadline is approaching with many reforms only partially implemented and no action taken on others.

Certainly, the Group of 18's deadline should not be interpreted as an end to the process. The General Assembly has already recognized this fact by extending the staff reduction exercise into the 1990–1991 biennium. The reform of the economic and social sectors remains on the agenda of the General Assembly and follow-up actions are expected. We regret that all of the recommendations of the Group of 18 have not yet been implemented but remain committed to working with all parties to complete the task. As we have stated, much has already been accomplished for which the Secretary General and member states deserve credit. The momentum for change, which has brought much needed improvements in UN operations and programs, must not be lost.

CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Fifth Committee considered the report of the Secretary General on the current financial crisis of the United Nations which, *inter alia,* described the financial situation of the organization in 1989, its financial prospects for 1990 and the conclusions of the Secretary General. Based on the report of the Secretary General and the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions , the Fifth Committee, on December 19, adopted, by consensus, a draft resolution on the current financial crisis and financial emergency of the United Nations. Reflecting the draft resolution of the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly, on December 21, adopted resolution 44/195 without a vote. Unlike previous years, the resolution merged two agenda items, "Current financial crisis of the United Nations" and "Financial emergency of the United Nations," under a single resolution comprising two parts to reflect the distinct agenda items.

In his report, the Secretary General indicated that, as of December 8, total assessed contributions outstanding amounted to $529.2 million. The outstanding balance was comprised of $261.9 million for current year, 1989, assessments and $267.3 million for prior years. Only 72 member states had paid fully their assessed contributions to the regular budget in 1989 at this time, as compared to 79 member states in 1988.

Of the total $529.2 million outstanding for the regular budget, $430.1 million was owed by the United States. Through December 31 the United States had paid $130 million toward its 1989 UN regular budget assessment totaling $216.2 million.

The Secretary General's cash flow projections through the end of 1989 indicated that the United Nations would avoid insolvency only by repeated use of reserves and lower expenditures than had previously been anticipated. The lower expenditures were attributable primarily to currency fluctuations and consistently high vacancy rates throughout the year. The 1989 cash flow projections, while indicating that insolvency of the organization would be forestalled, made no allowance for any additional unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for peacekeeping operations that could occur before the end of the year. In this regard, and looking toward future needs for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses relating to peacekeeping, the Secretary General requested that the size of the Working Capital Fund be increased substantially. In his report to the Fifth Committee under the separate agenda item, "Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of UN peacekeeping operations," the Secretary General requested an increase in the Working Capital Fund from the current authorized level of $100 million to $200 million.

Concerning cash flow projections for 1990, the Secretary General indicated that, based on the 1989 experience on the timing and amount of member payments and liquidation of obligations incurred during the year, all reserves would be exhausted and a negative cash balance would be incurred in the last quarter of 1990. In making this projection, the Secretary General provided the following explanation:

> During 1989 the capacity of the Working Capital Fund to finance unforeseen and extraordinary expenses relating to peacekeeping and peacemaking operations was strained to the limit, all the more so because that Fund was needed on a continuing basis to underwrite the shortfall created by nonpayment of assessed contributions to the regular budget. Therefore, if member states do not meet their legal obligations in 1990 to pay all assessed contributions in full and on time, the organization will be even more likely to face insolvency in 1990 than it was in 1989.

In the report conclusions, the Secretary General stated that the fragility of the UN's financial situation would continue so long as its reserves were not fully funded. He emphasized that the only real solution to the current financial crisis was payment by all member states of their assessed contributions in full and on time. So long as the reserves of the United Nations are not fully replenished, the Secretary General stated " . . . I shall be obliged to continue to seek the agreement of member states to a substantial increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund, as the only realistic buffer between the organization and bankruptcy."

With regard to the proposal to increase the Working Capital Fund, Mr. Michael Michalski, the U.S. Delegate to the Fifth Committee, made the following statement:

> . . . As in the past, the Secretary General has presented a proposal intended to respond to the UN's financial difficulties. Specifically, he has requested an increase of $100 million in the Working Capital Fund. My delegation has carefully considered this proposal and the alternatives of financing the increase. While we understand the Secretary General's need for assured income, we do not believe the proposal before us meets this objective. The Advisory Committee was not convinced that the analysis presented by the Secretary General on the financial emergency provided a sufficient basis for it to recommend the increase to the General Assembly. My delegation concurs with the Advisory Committee's analysis of the matter and its recommendation.

In adopting the draft resolution under this agenda item, the Fifth Committee did not approve an increase in the Working Capital Fund. As noted in Mr. Michalski's statement, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had earlier decided not to support such an increase at this stage and proposed that the issue be studied in greater depth next year by the Advisory Committee. A report on the Working Capital Fund will be issued at the 45th meeting of the UN General Assembly.

UN BUDGET

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, by consensus, resolution 44/202 approving the UN program budget for the 1990–1991 biennium. The resolution reflected the provisions of the draft resolution approved by the Fifth Committee on December 20, also by consensus decision.

Approval of the 1990–1991 UN program budget represented the successful culmination of the first full cycle of the new budget process called for in 1986 under resolution 41/213. All decisions taken in the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly, including approval last year of the 1990–1991 budget outline, were taken by consensus.

The approved 1990–1991 UN program budget calls for expenditures totaling $1,974,634,000, or $7,889,700 below the level of the budget outline approved last year by the General Assembly. Resolution 44/202 also included provision for a $15 million contingency fund to take account of budget add-ons in the 1990–1991 biennium. As a result of decisions taken during the 44th session of the General Assembly, amounts totaling $1,879,500 entailed budgetary implications for the contingency fund in 1990–1991.

A key issue during Fifth Committee deliberations on the 1990–1991 UN program budget concerned the reduction of high-level posts in the UN Secretariat. Among the UN reforms recommended in the report of the Group of 18 (Report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations—report prepared in 1985) was the reduction of 25 percent of high-level (Under Secretary General and Assistant Secretary General) posts in the UN Secretariat. The Secretary General's proposed 1990–1991 budget identified 10 high-level posts for elimination (elimination of 14 posts required to meet the Group of 18's 25 percent target), including the downgrading of the Chief of the UN Military Observer Group, India-Pakistan (UNMOGIP) from an Assistant Secretary General to a D-2 level. Several delegations objected to elimination of certain high-level posts, especially Pakistan with regard to the downgrading of the UNMOGIP position. Other delegations, particularly the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France, supported measures that would not erode progress toward full implementation of the high-level post reduction. After extensive deliberations, the Fifth Committee's draft resolution accepted the Secretary General's proposals regarding the 10 posts and requested the Secretary General to continue efforts to identify, as soon as possible, in the course of the 1990–1991 biennium, four additional posts for reduction.

Other measures approved in the 1990–1991 UN program budget resolution included a request for the Secretary General to review the functions and administrative support of the departments having mandates related to global social issues and to submit proposals, as appropriate, for the strengthening of the UN office in Vienna. The language followed contention between developing and certain developed countries regarding the Secretary General's proposed transfer of certain global social activities (and seven posts) from New York to Vienna. The developing countries strongly opposed the proposed transfer and would not accept a compromise proposal. The language contained in the draft resolution was an attempt to placate certain developed countries, particularly Austria, after it became clear that the transfer would not be carried out at this time.

The resolution addressed several proposals to enhance the efficiency and economy of UN operations. Included were issues relating to reimbursement to the regular budget of the cost of accommodation of extrabudgetary posts, implementation of the plan for the optical disc project as endorsed by the Joint Inspection Unit, study of costs relating to the after service health insurance program and intensification of efforts to attract voluntary contributions for the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) to obviate the need for regular budget subvention.

The Fifth Committee addressed the problem of workload standards and statistics for the Department of Conference Services (DCS). The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had requested the DCS to submit reports on these matters by the end of 1989. Since the DCS had not complied with the request, the draft resolution called for the submission of these reports to the ACABQ in the spring of 1990 and to the General Assembly at its 45th session. The ACABQ report on the 1990–1991 UN program budget indicated that the DCS workload did not take into account the introduction of modern technologies (i.e., office automation). The above reports and the review of the DCS to be conducted by the Secretariat and the Committee on Conferences could provide a basis for further staff reductions in the DCS.

An issue with significant budgetary implications for 1990–1991 concerned recommendations made by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) regarding across-the-board salary increases. The issue was covered under the separate agenda item titled, "The UN common system: the report of the International Civil Service Commission." The final resolution approved for this agenda item did not threaten the level of the 1990–1991 budget outline as had originally been feared. A detailed discussion of this issue is provided in this book under the heading, the International Civil Service Commission.

Following the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 44/202 on December 21, Ambassador Alexander F. Watson, Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, delivered the U.S. explanation of position on the 1990–1991 UN program budget. In recognizing the significance of the approved 1990–1991 budget in the context of UN reforms, Ambassador Watson stated

> . . . the capacity of the United Nations to contribute to the many critical problems on the international scene has been strengthened by important steps taken at this session of the General Assembly toward further implementation of administrative and budgetary reforms. Among the most significant accomplishments has been consensus adoption of the 1990–1991 program budget. This decision represents the successful completion of the new budgetary process approved by the 41st General Assembly. We can take satisfaction with this positive result and the important contributions made by the Secretary General and delegations to rebuilding confidence in the work of the United Nations.

Despite the success achieved by the United Nations in approving the 1990–1991 budget under the new budget reform procedure, Ambassador Watson noted that ". . . my delegation had some difficulties with specific elements of the approved budget." Specifically,

> . . . we regret the lack of acceptance for the Secretary General's proposal to transfer certain functions and staff from New York to strengthen the role of the Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and the budget continues funding for a number of activities which are objectionable to the United States. We have stated our reservations—and will continue to work with others for corrective actions—but in the spirit of fostering consensus, we did not vote against appropriations for these specific programs.

In his statement, Ambassador Watson called for further progress on achieving the agreed 15 percent reduction in Secretariat staff: " . . . we are not there yet—more needs to be done and we are encouraged that the General Assembly will address this issue next year."

In concluding his statement, Ambassador Watson again reiterated the important achievement of the United Nations as a result of its consensus adoption of the 1990–1991 program budget as envisaged in resolution 41/213. "This is an unprecedent achievement . . . ," he concluded, " . . . the continuation of which will add importantly to rebuilding the confidence among member states required for the United Nations to be successful in carrying out the increasing responsibilities entrusted to it."

AUDIT REPORTS

The Fifth Committee considered the financial reports and audited financial statements for 1988 of the UN Development Program (UNDP), the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the voluntary funds administered by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the UN Population Fund (UNFPA). The Fifth Committee considered also the reports and audit opinions of the Board of Auditors and the reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions regarding the financial reports and audited statements of the above organizations.

In Fifth Committee deliberations on this agenda item, the U.S. Delegation focused on the audit findings concerning UNDP and UNFPA. In his statement, delivered on October 4, the U.S. Representative to the Fifth Committee, Mr. Lawrence Grossman, noted the concern of the U.S. Delegation that, once again, qualified audit reports were issued for UNDP and UNFPA. While significant progress had been made to previous qualifications by the external auditors, other problems persisted. Also, he noted that, despite the fact that the auditors issued unqualified opinions for the other agencies, the opinions did not suggest the absence of financial problems in UNRWA and UNHCR as well.

With regard to UNDP, Mr. Grossman stated " . . . while UNDP received a third consecutive qualified opinion, we are encouraged by the progress made by the Administrator and his staff in resolving many of the issues identified by the auditors." As had previously been the case, the primary basis for the qualified opinion was the absence of audited expenditure data for UNDP funded programs executed by some agencies and governments. This was a problem addressed at the 36th meeting of the UNDP Governing Council which recommended as a solution a change in UNDP's audit cycle from an annual to a biennial basis. Such a change would allow UNDP to receive audit certificates from all executing agencies and eliminate a major element of uncertainty in reporting on a substantial portion of expenditures and obligations. The U.S. Delegation concurred with the Governing Council's recommendation and urged that it be adopted by the Fifth Committee in its draft resolution:

> . . . we strongly support this proposal since it does not reduce oversight by member states. The Board of Auditors would be permitted to issue a report on their findings and recommendations resulting from the audit examination of substantive matters, including management issues, carried out in respect of the first year of each biennium.

With regard to another organization which had earlier adopted a biennial audit cycle, the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), Mr. Grossman noted that, because the UNICEF audit procedure does not permit the board to issue a report in the first year of each biennium on management issues, the U.S. Delegation would recommend that the 44th General Assembly request the Board of Auditors to prepare such a report beginning in 1990 and request UNICEF to amend its financial regulations to permit such reporting.

In noting UNDP's lack of progress in receiving audited financial statements from projects executed by governments, Mr. Grossman suggested that

> . . . the Assembly should urge the (Governing) Council to consider freezing the award of new projects to those governments which in the Administrator's view have been unwilling to provide audit certificates. Such a measure would underscore the seriousness of the issue and the penalties for failure to comply with established procedures.

Other concerns noted by the U.S. Delegation included duplication and overlap in UNDP's public information activities, the accuracy of UNDP's project budgeting and, with regard to the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the duplication (and attendant costs) of activities carried out by UNIFEM and the Division for Women in Development. This latter problem was addressed by a number of delegations in the UNDP Governing Council as well as by the ACABQ, however, no effort was made to define the relationship between UNIFEM and the Division.

With regard to the UN Population Fund, it was noted that a major reason for the qualification of the audit opinion for the third consecutive year, as with UNDP, was the lack of audit certificates or clearances received from executing agencies which operate on a biennial audit cycle. To mitigate this difficulty, the U.S. Delegation recommended that, like UNDP, the UNFPA audit cycle be changed from an annual to a biennial basis. It was noted also that another factor contributing to the audit qualification was the lack of certainty over what expenditures are considered to be program expenditures versus those which are classified as administrative and program support service expenditures. This latter difficulty was noted in the course of the audit of UNFPA expenditures charged to interregional projects.

The U.S. Delegation endorsed the recommendation made earlier by the UNDP Governing Council that the UNFPA audit cycle be changed to a biennial basis. With regard to the difficulties of program and administrative expenditures, Mr. Grossman stated

> . . . we share the auditors' concerns, particularly in the area of accounting for expenses related to UNFPA publications. This matter was debated extensively at the 36th session of the UNDP Governing Council and the results of the debate are reflected in Council decision 89/49. We note with interest that UNFPA agrees that further clarification in this area is needed.

Other delegations which spoke in the Fifth Committee were, in general, dissatisfied with the progress achieved in implementing previous recommendations by the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. All delegations which spoke criticized the late issuance of two documents which reported on follow-up measures taken by the Secretariats of the United Nations, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNRWA and UNHCR. The delay did not allow the ACABQ and the Board to examine the reports and provide written comments as called for under UN General Assembly resolution 43/216 on the efficacy of follow-up measures. Developing countries, particularly Egypt, India and Ghana, were very critical of the management of the audited organizations. Their delegations believed that the organizations did not take seriously the audit process and urged that oversight measures be strengthened.

The Fifth Committee's draft resolution on this agenda item was approved on October 17, by consensus decision. Key provisions of the draft resolution included the following:

— Requests the governing bodies of UNDP and UNFPA to require the executive heads concerned to take immediate steps within their competence to correct or improve conditions that gave rise to the qualification of the audit opinions of the Board of Auditors.

— Approves the changes in financial procedures of UNDP, as recommended in Governing Council decision 89/61, and for UNFPA, as recommended in Governing Council decision 89/49.

— Requests the Board of Auditors to carry out an audit examination of substantive matters, including management issues, for UNICEF in respect of the first year of each biennium and to submit a report to the General Assembly through the ACABQ and the UNICEF Executive Board.

— Requests the governing bodies of the audited organizations which are on a biennial audit cycle (e.g., the United Nations) to review the periodicity of audits bearing in mind the desirability for annual reporting on management issues.

— Invites the Board to keep under review the stated accounting policies of each organization and to draw to the attention of the General Assembly specific areas in which it considers that there are differences in accounting policies with a view to harmonizing practices among the audited agencies and programs.

The draft resolution approved by the Fifth Committee was adopted without a vote by the General Assembly on December 19, as resolution 44/183.

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

At the 44th meeting of the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee adopted by consensus decision seven draft resolutions relating to financing of UN peacekeeping operations. All draft resolutions were subsequently adopted by the General Assembly by consensus decision.

In accord with Security Council resolution 644 of November 7, which established the UN Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA), the General Assembly, on December 7, adopted resolution 44/44 which approved funding for ONUCA's initial 6-month mandate period extending from November 7, 1989, through May 6, 1990. UN funding of ONUCA would be done through a special account under which member states are assessed in accord with the special scale adopted for peacekeeping operations. Resolution 44/44 appropriated $40,800,000 for the operation of ONUCA for its initial 6-month mandate period ending May 6, 1990. In addition, the resolution authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for ONUCA at a rate not to exceed $4,524,100 (gross) per month, with prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, for the 12-

month period beginning May 7, 1990. Continuation of ONUCA beyond May 6, 1990, would be contingent upon Security Council renewal of the force mandate.

Based on draft resolutions approved by the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly, on December 21, adopted by consensus decision continued appropriations for the operation of the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Resolution 44/187 appropriated $18,114,000 (gross) for the operation of UNDOF for the period June 1 to November 30, 1989, and $20,208,000 for the period from December 1, 1989, to May 31, 1990. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for UNDOF at a rate not to exceed $3,368,000 (gross) per month for the period June 1 to November 30, 1990, should the Security Council decide to continue the force. Resolution 44/188 appropriated $142,842,000 for the operation of UNIFIL for the period February 1, 1989, through January 31, 1990. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for the operaton of UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed $12,001,000 per month (gross) for the 12-month period beginning February 1, 1990, should the Security Council renew the UNIFIL mandate.

On December 18 the Fifth Committee approved by consensus a draft resolution on the financing of the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG). The General Assembly, on December 21, adopted by consensus resolution 44/189 which reflected the recommendation of the Fifth Committee. The resolution approved an appropriation of $34,153,825 for the operation of UNIIMOG for the period October 1, 1989, through March 31, 1990, and authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for the operation of UNIIMOG at a rate not to exceed $6,401,333 per month (gross) for the 6-month period from April 1 through September 30, 1990, subject to decision of the Security Council to renew the UNIIMOG mandate beyond March 31, 1990. Also, reflecting the report of the Secretary General which notes substantial voluntary contributions in cash and in kind made to UNIIMOG, lower than expected expenditures and the relatively high rate of collections on assessed contributions, the General Assembly decided in resolution 44/189 to credit $10,000,000 of the "unencumbered balance" toward member assessments for the period April 1 to September 30, 1990. An additional $10,117,762 of the unencumbered balance may be credited toward member assessments in 1990 depending on the level of payments of assessed contributions.

With regard to financing of the UN Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM), the Secretary General's performance report indicated projected savings of $861,000. The initial appropriation for UNAVEM was $9,193,000 for the period January 3, 1989, to January 2, 1990. In view of the assessed contributions still outstanding ($1.6 million), the Secretary General recommended that no action be taken on these savings at that time. Taking account of the Secretary General's recommendation, the Fifth Committee approved on December 18, by consensus, a draft resolution which appropriated $5,826,400 for the operation of UNAVEM for the 12 months beginning January 3, 1990, and ending January 2, 1991. The Fifth Committee recommendation was adopted by consensus as resolution 44/190 by the General Assembly on December 21.

In his performance report concerning the UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), the Secretary General revised downward the expenditures relating to UNTAG from $416,162,000 (originally appropriated in February 1989 for the operation of UNTAG for 12 months beginning April 1, 1989) to $366,890,000. An additional $6,469,000 (gross) would be required to cover costs for the liquidation phase of UNTAG which would bring the total, revised cost of UNTAG to $373,359,000. The report indicated that approximately $94.6 million of assessed contributions for UNTAG remained unpaid. For this reason, and because a performance report on the budget of UNTAG is to be submitted to the 45th session of the General Assembly, the Secretary General recommended that the General Assembly defer taking any action on the UNTAG budget based on the initial performance report.

In its review of the Secretary General's report, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions noted that the revised estimates did not take into account voluntary cash contributions totaling $13,050,000. The ACABQ recommended that all voluntary contributions received be reflected in the Secretary General's performance report to the General Assembly. The ACABQ also recommended that the Secretary General provide it with a precise schedule of UNTAG equipment to be placed in reserve and the related value of each category of equipment at the spring 1990 session of the ACABQ. The ACABQ further recommended that any agreement for the transfer of equipment from the United Nations to the duly recognized government of Namibia be submitted to the ACABQ for review prior to the agreement being signed. The ACABQ concurred with the Secretary General's recommendation that the General Assembly "defer taking any such action as may be called for in consequence of the performance report" (excludes action related to disposition of UNTAG equipment and approval of costs relating to the UNTAG liquidation phase).

In approving by consensus a draft resolution on the financing of UNTAG, the Fifth Committee approved the Secretary General's plan for disposing UNTAG equipment in accord with the recommendations of the ACABQ. The Committee also approved $6,469,000 (gross) in liquidation costs estimated for UNTAG.

It decided to defer any action on the estimated unencumbered balance of the UNTAG appropriation as may be called for until the 45th session of the General Assembly at which time the Secretary General would submit a detailed (second) performance report on the force. The Fifth Committee draft resolution was adopted by consensus by the General Assembly on December 21 as resolution 44/191.

The Fifth Committee's consensus approval of the draft resolution on Administrative and Budgetary Aspects of UN Peacekeeping Operations followed closely the recommendations of the ACABQ. Several issues were covered under this agenda item. A key issue concerned the Secretary General's request to increase the level of the Working Capital Fund from $100 million to $200 million to cover start-up costs of UN peacekeeping operations. In accord with the recommendation of the ACABQ, the Fifth Committee did not accept the proposal at this session. Another key issue under this agenda item concerned the Secretary General's proposal to create a $15 million reserve stock of supplies and equipment for UN peacekeeping operations. The Fifth Committee accepted the recommendation of the ACABQ which, while not completely rejecting the proposal, recommended further study of the issue. The Fifth Committee accepted the Secretary General's proposal regarding the use of civilian personnel in peacekeeping operations, subject to the recommendations of the ACABQ, in particular the establishment of standard administrative procedures to govern provision of such personnel. The Fifth Committee invited member states to submit lists of civilian personnel and equipment to be made available to the United Nations on short notice. The Secretary General's proposed guidelines for the treatment and valuation of voluntary contributions in the form of supplies and services were also endorsed. To improve Secretariat coordination of UN peacekeeping activities, the Fifth Committee accepted the Secretary General's plan to establish a planning and monitoring group within the Secretariat. Further, the Fifth Committee requested a report from the Secretary General at the 45th session of the General Assembly on measures taken to implement the recommendations of the ACABQ on these issues and to provide further information on the following subject areas: economies of scale; establishment of a reserve stock of supplies and equipment; use of civilian personnel and matters relating to the financing and use of administrative posts (mainly at UN Headquarters) attached to each peacekeeping operation.

Also under this agenda item, the Fifth Committee considered at length the placing of certain countries in the various groupings of the special scale of assessments for UN peacekeeping operations. Reflecting its difficult economic situation, Poland initiated the debate with a request to move from Group B (developed countries), which pay the regular budget rate on peacekeeping assessments, to Group C (developing countries), which pay 20 percent of their regular budget rates for UN peacekeeping. For Poland, the change in groups would reduce their peacekeeping assessment rate from 0.56 percent to 0.112 percent. Several developing countries in Group C requested to be moved to Group D (least developed countries) which would result in their paying 10 percent (as opposed to 20 percent) of their regular budget rates under the special peacekeeping scale of assessments. The countries requesting such a change were the Central African Republic, Burma (Myanmar), Equitorial Guinea, Gambia, Mauritania, Sierra Leone and Togo. These countries were paying peacekeeping assessment rates of 0.002 percent. By moving to Group D, their rates would be reduced to 0.001 percent. Under standard procedure, all of the above changes would result in increased assessment rates for the Group A countries (the 5 Permanent Members of the Security Council). The increases, however, were offset by Spain's offer to move from Group C to Group B over a 3-year period beginning in 1990. The action by Spain marginally reduced the peacekeeping rate for the United States from 30.758 percent in 1989 to 30.690 percent in 1990. The Fifth Committee's draft resolution approved all of the requested changes.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, by consensus, resolution 44/192 titled, "Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of peacekeeping operations." Action by the General Assembly, reflected the draft resolution approved earlier by the Fifth Committee.

SCALES OF ASSESSMENT

The Fifth Committee considered the agenda item, Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations, at its 13th, 17th, 18th, 20th to 23rd and 25th meetings on October 17, 23 -27 and 30, 1989.

Last year the General Assembly adopted resolution 43/223 which, *inter alia*, prescribed the scales of assessment for 1989 through 1991 and requested the Committee on Contributions to devise a methodology for future scales for consideration at the 45th meeting of the General Assembly. Debate this year in the Fifth Committee was mainly technical in nature with most delegations calling for methodologies that would minimize their own financial obligations. Large debt ridden countries such as Brazil and Argentina called for scales which weigh heavily the negative impact that foreign debt has on the ability of member states to pay their assessments. Other countries, primarily developing and less developed, stressed their own particular economic difficulties and sought to ensure that any new methodology for determining the scales of assessment would take these difficulties into account. Venezuela, along with many G-77 countries, sought to change the composition of the Committee on Contributions by replacing a Western group member and an Eastern member with developing country representatives, including another Latin American. As a result of strong opposition by developed country members, including the United States, this initiative was essentially glossed over in the language contained in the final draft resolution which calls upon the General Assembly to " . . . continue at its 45th session its consideration of the functioning of the Committee on Contributions on the basis of the views to be expressed by that Committee in its report."

The floor and ceiling rates in the scale of assessments, 0.01 percent and 25 percent, respectively, were not addressed this year.

On December 19 the Fifth Committee adopted by consensus its draft resolution on the scale of assessments. The draft resolution, as recommended by the Fifth Committee, was adopted by consensus as resolution 44/197 on December 21 by the General Assembly.

The resolution on the scale of assessments contained three parts. Part A reaffirmed the principles for determining assessments, including "capacity to pay" as the "fundamental criterion." The resolution also called for the scale to be more "transparent and stable over time." Juxtaposed against this were paragraphs to take into account factors such as debt adjustment, a per capita income limit, a scheme to avoid excessive variations of individual rates between successive scales and other complexities. Part B endorsed the revised assessment procedures for nonmember states as proposed in paragraphs 50 to 52 of the report of the Committee on Contributions. Part C requested, in part, the Committee on Contributions

> . . . to examine the question of providing access of member states to information on how the Committee, being an expert body, arrives at its decisions on the scale of assessments, and to submit specific recommendations to the General Assembly at its 45th session on how to establish an effective mechanism of communication between member states and the Committee, in particular by holding information meetings at its regular session before the preparation of a new scale and during the consideration of *ad hoc* adjustments . . . . "

The effect of language in Part C is to reduce distrust among some G–77 delegations who are unhappy with the Committee's work, particularly on "mitigation"—a procedure that provides *ad hoc* relief to developing countries in paying their assessments.

In his statement before the Fifth Committee on October 26, Mr. John D. Fox, the U.S. Representative to the Fifth Committee, commented on the continuing efforts of the Committee on Contributions to develop a mechanism for determining the scale of assessments which is as simple and transparent as possible and which results in a scale which is fair and distributes the expenses of the organization equitably. In recalling General Assembly work on this issue last year, Mr. Fox noted the following:

> Last year's resolution on this item, resolution 43/223, . . . requested the Committee on Contributions to undertake a comprehensive review of all aspects of the existing methodology for determining assessments. While joining consensus, my delegation indicated its doubt about the likelihood that this resolution would contribute significantly to the improvement of the methodology for determining the scale or to assuring wider agreement on future scales of assessments. Without radical change in the parameters set for the Committee, it is unclear that any resolution could have great success in terms of these objectives.

In noting various aspects of the report prepared by the Committee on Contributions and comments made by member states, Mr. Fox stated,

> . . . while all delegations have urged the Committee on Contributions to develop a methodology that is both simple and fair, we have yet to discover the means to achieve both objectives. Many of the proposals have been considered by the Committee on Contributions and have been rejected because they have not produced the results expected by some delegations.

Mr. Fox continued,

> In our view, the problem of the scale of assessments will not be solved through "technical creativity" as one delegation suggested at the 43rd session. Many of the ideas put forward, if adopted, would further complicate the process and generate a scale that would increase the organization's dependence on an even smaller number of countries. This would be unfortunate, and not in the interest of the organization. Indeed, the need to avoid such an outcome is a major reason why my delegation never has accepted without reservation the capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion for determining the scale of assessments for an organization composed of sovereign member states.

Mr. Fox expressed the view that the best way of addressing the concern of many member states that assessments are too high is by controlling the level of the budget, " . . . in this way all member states benefit." In conclusion, Mr. Fox summarized the view of the United States regarding further instructions from the Fifth Committee on the scale of assessments:

> . . . as we have discovered from previous debates on methodology, proposed changes usually just add to the complexity of the scale and fail to produce the desired results. Therefore, we believe the Fifth Committee should refrain from providing further detailed instructions to the Committee on Contributions.

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM AND COORDINATION

The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC) is the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming and coordination. In addition, one of the key elements of the 1986 package of UN administrative and budgetary reforms accorded to CPC is a central role in a new, consensus-based decision-making process for the UN program budget. CPC now plays a vital role in U.S. efforts to exercise appropriate influence on the size and priorities of that budget.

Committee members are nominated by ECOSOC on the basis of regional balance, and elected on a staggered basis by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. The Committee is presently composed of 34 member states.*

In 1989 CPC held its annual session in New York from May 8 through June 5. The major topics considered were (1) the proposed program budget for the 1990—1991 biennium and related issues; (2) the review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations; (3) program coordination issues; (4) review of certain evaluation activities; and (5) cross-organizational program analyses (COPA).

---

*Membership in 1989 was: Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Columbia, Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

ECOSOC reviewed CPC's annual report at its summer session. It endorsed CPC's conclusions and recommendations in resolution 1989/97 on July 26. The 44th General Assembly considered the CPC report under its agenda item on program planning. CPC's recommendations were approved without change and without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 44/194.)

Proposed UN Program Budget For 1990–1991

CPC now plays a major role in setting the size, priorities and content of the UN's biennial budget. This role was fully tested for the first time when CPC reviewed in detail the proposed budget for 1990–1991. Although discussions were often lengthy and sometimes contentious, at their conclusion CPC was able to achieve consensus on this item. This paved the way for eventual adoption of a budget that was within the overall total set in 1988 and approved by the General Assembly in December 1988. Maintenance of the level agreed to at the 43rd Assembly, and agreement to do so through consensus decision, were the major U.S. goals at the 1989 session of CPC.

Achievement of this consensus was not easy. The budget as proposed exceeded the total in the previously approved outline by well over a million dollars. The explanation given for this was the inability of the Secretary General to absorb the full costs associated with 50 of the 100 posts which the 1988 UN General Assembly had restored to the Department of Conference Services. The United States and other concerned delegations made strong statements in support of the previously agreed budget level, insisting that in a program budget of approximately $2 billion, there should be sufficient flexibility to move the necessary funds from one program to another without needing to request additional resources. Other delegations disagreed with this, calling it a misinterpretation of the intent of the 1988 budget level resolution. Ultimately, it was agreed that since the major contributors placed great importance on adherence to the previously agreed budget level, all delegations would accept the proposed consensus.

CPC also reviewed in detail all sections of the proposed budget. The new posts for narcotic drug control were discussed at length before being recommended for endorsement by the General Assembly. Strenuous U.S. efforts to underscore the global priority of UN drug control programs failed to convince some other delegations, but in the end the programmatic conclusions taken on this budget section remained a stronger endorsement than that given to any other budget section.

The proposed transfer of seven posts from New York (the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs) to Vienna (Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) also proved contentious. Some delegations felt that this proposal threatened an adverse impact on delivery of economic assistance programs and they resisted any consensus declaration. Ultimately, CPC could only agree to remain uncommitted on this issue, sending it forward without recommendation, to be dealt with in the more political arena of the General Assembly.

The budget section on the Department of Public Information (DPI) was controversial for several reasons, primarily the proposed reorganization of that department. Also, it was generally agreed that the program narrative paid insufficient attention to development issues (the U.S. Delegation concurred). The lengthy debate resurrected many criticisms of the DPI made in previous years. Finally, unable to reach any consensus on the language of the program narrative, CPC reverted to the descriptions of DPI objectives in the UN Medium-Term Plan: a "laundry list" with little practical meaning.

In spite of the failure to resolve several key issues, CPC did act responsibly in this first full implementation of its budget decision-making role. One lesson that emerged was that fiscal discipline will remain a shared responsibility between CPC and the ACABQ. In fact, CPC urged the General Assembly to adopt the budget in light of ACABQ's detailed recommendations and also suggested that ACABQ deal with several specific budget issues (e.g., official travel costs). This cooperative attitude is a good omen for future years.

Program Performance For 1987–1988

Over the past few years, several UN General Assembly resolutions mandated efforts toward major reform in the management of the United Nations, one part of which was intended to be a reduction in high-level Secretariat posts. CPC received another progress report from the Secretary General on his efforts to comply with this mandate. It indicated continued progress on reductions, but as happened with a very similar report in 1988, it also provoked deep disagreement over which posts should be eliminated and the probable impact of such reductions on program delivery. Opinions were so varied and so strongly held that CPC finally felt compelled to send this report on to the General Assembly without recommendation. As it had in the past, the Committee requested the Assembly to keep this topic under review and again urged the Secretary General to use flexibility in implementing this provision of General Assembly resolution 41/213.

The Committee reviewed a report on all aspects of priority-setting in future outlines of the proposed program budget. In 1988 CPC had not been able to reach agreement on related proposals on this topic, and it fared no better in 1989. Although the report was well done, it reopened all of the questions regarding the relationship of this topic to such things as UN General Assembly mandates and the relevance of funding considerations to priority-setting. Finally, CPC decided that it had insufficient time to examine this topic in depth and transmitted this report also to the Assembly without recommendations.

Program Coordination

ECOSOC resolution 1988/77 on the revitalization of that body served as the backdrop for the items discussed under this heading. That resolution projected a greater direct role for ECOSOC in coordination matters and requested the views of CPC as the UN's chief organ for coordination issues, particularly on the rationalization of coordination instruments. However, many delegations declared the guidelines in the ECOSOC resolution to be unclear, and were accordingly reluctant to develop firm recommendations without a better understanding of the reasoning which produced 1988/77.

There were also many delegations (at least a few from each of the regional groups) who expressed concern that the revitalization process could lead to the loss by CPC of its present role as the main intergovernmental body which reviews issues of interagency coordination. The United States however, as well as other delegations, expressed its view that CPC had in reality, already forfeited this coordination role through neglect; that the Committee was really at too low a level in the UN's intergovernmental machinery to perform a genuinely important interagency role; and that CPC was too preoccupied with exclusively UN matters to do much system-wide coordinating. Therefore, without significant progress on "streamlining" ECOSOC, such fundamental and conflicting points of view on the proper coordination role for CPC will likely obstruct any possible future progress on rationalizing coordination instruments.

Review of Evaluation Activities

Two evaluation reports received in-depth review. One dealt with the human rights program; the other with the program on development issues and policies.

The human rights report was of great importance to the United States and most other delegations. Many of them judged this report to be a fair and positively focused assessment of the UN's ongoing activities with useful suggestions for program improvements. However, the discussions produced much controversy and debate was lengthy and contentious. There were 18 specific recommendations for program improvements and CPC failed to achieve consensus on any of them. Opponents charged that this report was "too substantive," or that it was "unbalanced" in its coverage. The report was also challenged on procedural grounds, with some members insisting that CPC could not consider this report until it had first been reviewed by the UN Human Rights Commission. The result was dissension and stalemate.

The other in-depth evaluation report (development issues and policies) had originally been scheduled for presentation to CPC's 1988 session but was deferred because the Secretariat had been unable to present the report in time.

CPC did review it in 1989, expressing regret at its late issuance. The Committee criticized the structure of the report, asserting that there should have been greater focus on the efforts of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (DIESA) to facilitate negotiations among member states on the world economic and social situation. CPC also concluded that the views of national governments should have been given greater emphasis and that there was an obvious need to improve the questionnaires used.

The Committee was generally favorable to the rest of the report on development issues and policies, but acceptance of its most action-oriented recommendations was adversely affected by the controversy over the human rights report. One Committee member blocked consensus on endorsement of the most substantive recommendations in order to show displeasure with the refusal of certain non-aligned member states to accept the human rights report. Especially affected by this action were those recommendations which inferred any expansion of activities for DIESA, the Economic Commission for Africa and the Department of Technical Cooperation for Development. As a consequence, this report became more of a polemical debate on mandates than an evaluation of program effectiveness. While this confrontational tactic did emphasize Western concerns regarding the importance of the human rights report, it also brought politicization to this and other aspects of the Committee's work. It made negotiation of CPC's commentaries on individual sections of the draft budget much more difficult as well.

In the course of its consideration of the in-depth report on development issues and policies, CPC gave special attention to programs carried out by the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). The Committee was critical of this portion of the report, labeling it as merely a priority-setting review, not a true evaluation. CPC called for a further in-depth evaluation of the program on development issues and policies of the ECA, to be submitted to CPC at its 1991 session, with a progress report due in 1990.

CPC also considered its usual agenda of in-depth evaluation reports that are either in progress or in follow-up. In its review of the follow-up report on recommendations made in 1986 on the UN population program, CPC was pleased to note that significant actions had been taken.

After reviewing a progress report on the scheduled 1990 evaluation of the disarmament program, CPC rejected much of the proposed methodology. Committee members asserted that decisions taken by member governments on disarmament and the reasons therefore, were not proper subjects for investigation by academics and nongovernmental organizations. CPC therefore requested a revised progress report in 1990 on the methodology and also revised scheduling of what will be the first ever in-depth evaluation of a UN political program. Accordingly, this report will be delayed beyond its original completion date of 1991.

Regarding the in-depth evaluation program in general, CPC stressed the need for further improvements in methodology and urged a more qualitative approach in analyses wherever justified by programmatic considerations. It agreed that CPC's own membership could be used by the Secretariat as a geographically diverse sample for future questionnaires. It recommended to the General Assembly that it approve the topic of "international protection of and assistance to refugees" for the 1993 evaluation. It agreed to try, experimentally, the scheduling of evaluation follow-up reviews on a biennial, instead of triennial schedule. Finally, CPC canceled the scheduled review of the 1987 evaluation on electronic data processing and information systems because of the technical nature of the topic and the anticipated heavy workload for the 1990 session.

Cross Organizational Program Analyses

Cross Organizational Program Analyses (COPA) were designed as a mechanism to assist ECOSOC in the implementation of its Charter responsibility to coordinate the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Each year CPC reviews several COPAs, either completed, in progress or in follow-up. However in 1988, because of its greatly increased workload, CPC took a critical look at this aspect of its agenda and recommended major changes, including the abolition of COPAs as they were structured at that time, in favor of a briefer document tentatively referred to as a "thematic analysis." ECOSOC endorsed this change. (Resolution 1988/77.) At the 1989 CPC session, the Committee followed on from that resolution by recommending that the final COPA (industrial development) under the old formula be completed according to plan. CPC did not schedule a COPA for 1991, but cited general interest in an interagency review of programs in human resources development. CPC did not indicate specifically whether or not the "COPA" title would be retained.

Regarding the structure and scope of future "thematic analyses," CPC concluded that forthcoming discussions in ECOSOC would better define the scope and character of the type of reports called for in 1988/77. CPC recommended to ECOSOC that the new reports should provide a more qualitiative assessment of the current status of coordination in particular sectors of UN activities and should suggest action-oriented, forward-looking recommendations on ways and means to improve that coordination. CPC also emphasized the need for executive summaries of these future analyses as well as other voluminous UN documents.

In this context, CPC reviewed the preliminary report on presentation of the COPA topic for 1990 (activities related to industrial development). The importance of a COPA on this topic was emphasized and CPC stressed the need to underscore the central role of UNIDO and other organizations. CPC also requested that the COPA highlight three themes: the industrialization needs of less developed countries; progress on implementation of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa; and the role of women in industrialization.

CPC reviewed the 1989 COPA on UN activities related to the advancement of women. In general, CPC was pleased with this report, approving its scope, organization and content. Some delegations complained that the report was not detailed enough with regard to women under apartheid and Palestinian women. However, in its formal action on the report, the Committee agreed with the conclusions and recommendations made and encouraged the Secretary General to continue his efforts to fulfill the mandates for the advancement of women, which member states had already adopted in various fora.

CPC quickly reviewed a document pertaining to a COPA originally presented to the Committee in 1983. That COPA had dealt with activities of the UN system in human settlements. At its 1986 session, CPC rejected the triennial follow-up report on this COPA because it had judged the actions taken to implement CPC's recommendations, to be too evasive and wholly inadequate. Subsequent attempts to satisfy CPC's wishes were also rejected. This year however, CPC accepted the report, concluding that it finally responded to CPC's request for full information on human settlements activities in the UN system.

In its review of the annual report of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), CPC sought to emphasize the role of the ACC and called for a more anaytical, coordination-oriented ACC report to member states, stressing the Secretary General's central role as chairman of the ACC.

JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) consists of 11 inspectors, chosen for their background and knowledge,* who are authorized to investigate matters pertaining to efficient and effective operations in the UN system. The Unit focuses on improving the management of UN programs and agencies and on encouraging greater coordination at all levels. The JIU statute is currently adhered to by 16 agencies in the UN system.

In 1989 the JIU published 11 reports on the following topics: the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia; rural development activities of the UN system in three African least developed countries; technical cooperation activities of the IMO for maritime training; review of a study program on Latin American economic integration; the structure of the UN Department of Public

---

*JIU inspectors serve in a personal capacity as experts on the UN system. They are appointed by the General Assembly for 5-year terms. Richard V. Hennes of the United States was an inspector and chairman of the JIU during 1989.

Information and a companion survey of the UN's network of information centers; a review of longstanding efforts to restructure the economic and social sectors of the UN system; procedures for equipment procurement on technical cooperation projects; a comparative analysis of UN budgeting techniques (two-volumes); human resources development through technical cooperation; and proposals for a modernized system of storage for records and documents.

While most of the 1989 reports had applicability across the UN system, they tended to concentrate on issues related to the more efficient functioning of economic development activities. This is a consequence of resolutions passed in recent years by the UN General Assembly which expressed the preference of member states for greater emphasis by the JIU on aspects of this subject. The United States has not opposed this trend but will closely monitor it to guard against erosion of the JIU's flexibility.

For the United States, the two most significant reports issued for 1989 which were reviewed were the survey of document storage facilities and the two-volume review of UN technical cooperation project evaluation systems. Also important but not reviewed by UN bodies in 1989 were the reports on the comparative survey of major organizations' budgeting techniques and the review of the evaluation of rural development activities in three African least developed countries. It is expected that these reports will receive significant attention during 1990.

The two-volume report on technical cooperation project evaluation systems was a follow-on to earlier studies of the evaluation function which the JIU has published in recent years. It maintained the high standards of reporting evident in the earlier reports. It reviewed, *inter alia,* the principles which should govern the application of evaluation techniques to UN programs and activities, not just in technical cooperation, but throughout the UN system. As such, it was the best discussion of this topic to appear in UN publications in a long time. The report was comprehensive in its review of project evaluation theory, as that can be applied to UN activities.

This report also emphasized the many continuing problems faced by the UN system in the pursuit of meaningful evaluation of development operations. It noted, in particular, the general lack of an integrated approach to technical cooperation projects and put forward numerous proposals for improvements. The report argued persuasively that there is a need for thorough review of this function as well as a continuing need for critical analysis of evaluation activities in general.

The JIU report on facilities for records and document storage was the most recent in a continuing series on this topic, as well. In 1985, at the request of the United States, the JIU took its first look at the UN system's records and documents storage procedures and facilities. Since then, it has published three reports on this subject; all characterized the UN system's paper storage problems as steadily worsening, and proposed some practical remedies. The most significant of these proposed the adoption of an "optical disc" system of automated micro-copy storage and retrieval. This new technology appeared to offer the UN system a good opportunity to solve this seldom-noticed but troublesome and growing storage problem. And, even more important, it has the potential of providing a much more effective and less expensive distribution system.

As a result of the JIU's first report, one member state had agreed to underwrite the costs of an experimental optical disc system for the UN Office in Geneva. This experiment was a success, and the JIU's latest report proposes immediate adoption of a similar prototype system for the United Nations itself. At the 1989 UN General Assembly, member states endorsed the initiation of such a system but allocated only minimal funding for the 1990–1991 biennium. It is anticipated that significant additional funding will be made available in the 1992–1993 budget biennium.

In its 1989 annual report the JIU discussed the actions it had taken in compliance with a 43rd General Assembly resolution which requested changes in various aspects of the Unit's operating procedures. In its response, the JIU agreed to: continue active follow-up of previous report recommendations; revise the content of reports, giving more print space to evaluative rather than narrative prose; make greater efforts to improve the quality of its reports; continue its consultations with the participating organizations while the Unit's work plan is being developed; continue to carry out more surveys of management, budgetary and administrative issues, including those identified by the ACABQ; and recommend where appropriate, new procedures for encouraging more detailed consideration of its reports by appropriate UN bodies.

The Fifth Committee took cognizance of the JIU's annual report and welcomed the measures introduced. In its resolution the Committee requested the JIU to (1) give even greater attention to management, budgetary and administrative issues relevant to the agendas of the governing bodies of its participating organizations and to their main and common concerns; (2) continue to make every possible effort to issue its reports well in advance of meetings of the governing bodies of its participating organizations, in particular, the General Assembly, and of the relevant subsidiary bodies, in order to ensure that the comments of the Secretary General and those of the ACC are issued in accordance with existing regulations for the timely receipt of documentation; (3) make every effort to shorten its reports, using comparative tables and graphics and to include in its reports an executive summary of its recommendations in order to facilitate consideration.

The resolution also urged the Secretary General to strive for better coordination of his own efforts with those of the Unit in order to provide the

General Assembly with the greatest amount of information possible on implementation of JIU recommendations. It also asked the Secretary General to standardize the format of his reports relating to the work and recommendations of the JIU in order to include therein the recommendations of the Unit and any decisions of the General Assembly or other governing bodies before making his own comments.

This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly in plenary session, without a vote, on December 19, 1989. (Resolution 44/184.)

COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES

The Committee on Conferences conducted its substantive session on August 21–25, at which time it considered, *inter alia*, the following agenda items: adoption of the draft calendar of conferences and meetings for the 1990–1991 biennium; improvements in the utilization of conference servicing resources; consideration of the draft 1990–1991 calendar of conferences and meetings for the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC); control and limitation of documentation; recurrent publications of the United Nations; and review of the 1992–1997 medium-term plan for conference and library services.

The Committee on Conferences recommended that the General Assembly approve the draft calendar of conferences and meetings for 1989. The Committee decided also that the draft calendar for 1990 would continue to include a separate list of bodies whose mandates were due to expire at the end of 1989, but which were to be presented to the 44th General Assembly for renewal. With regard to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), the Committee on Conferences decided to add a footnote to the dates in the calendar which would indicate that " . . . the information presented with regard to dates was a provisional indication by the Secretariat on the basis of past practice." This footnote was added since no clear decision had been reached in COPUOS on either the venue or duration of the Legal Subcommittee's session. During discussions of this agenda item, the Delegate from the U.S.S.R., supported by the Delegate from Austria, drew attention to the overloaded schedule of conference activities in New York and Geneva, and emphasized the need for ensuring equal treatment of available conference centers in the United Nations so that conference activities would be distributed more evenly among the conference centers. The Chairman of the Committee, Ms. Franziska Friessnigg of Austria, unsuccessfully attempted to focus discussion on shifting more meetings to Vienna. A number of delegations stressed the need to abide by the established headquarters principle and noted that the notion of equal treatment of all conference centers was ambiguous. The Committee decided to review this issue in greater detail at its next session.

With regard to improved utilization of conference servicing resources, it was noted that the overall utilization rate of 76 percent and average utilization rate of 74 percent by UN organs represented a decline in the performance as compared to the previous year. The Committee again decided to request the Chairman to write letters to the UN organs that have utilized less than 75 percent of their available conference servicing resources. Concerning ECOSOC, the Committee had no difficulties with the draft calendar of conferences prepared for 1990–1991 by ECOSOC. It decided to encourage ECOSOC to extend for a further period the discontinuance of summary records for its sessional committees as well as for its subsidiary bodies.

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly extend for a further year the period during which no subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, with certain exceptions, should be entitled to summary records. The seven organs excepted from this provision are the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean; Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People; International Law Commission; Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space; Special Committee Against Apartheid; UN Commission on International Trade Law; and UN Council for Namibia.

With regard to recurrent publications of the United Nations the discussion focused on the role of the Committee on Conferences in carrying out its newly mandated functions outlined in General Assembly resolution 43/222 B, " . . . to monitor the policy of the organization on publications, with the assistance of the publications of the Secretariat and taking into account the positions adopted by the Committee on Information and other relevant bodies." The Committee agreed that its mandate did not require it to conduct a detailed and technical review of the organization's publications program. It requested that information on the volume of work and resources devoted to the production of the recurrent publications of the United Nations should be presented to the Committee for its review in 1990.

The Committee's review of the outline of the medium-term plan for the Department of Conference Servicing was cursory. The Committee will meet in early 1990 to review the medium-term plan prior to its submission to the Committee for Program and Coordination.

The Fifth Committee considered the item, Pattern of Conferences, at its 5th, 8th to 10th and 59th meetings, held on October 6, 10 and 11 and December 19. The U.S. statement was delivered on October 10 by Ms. Susan M. Shearouse, U.S. Representative to the Fifth Committee. In considering the draft resolution before the Fifth Committee, Ms. Shearouse indicated satisfaction that the Committee on Conferences had the opportunity to review the draft 1990–1991 calendar of conferences and meetings of subsidiary organs of ECOSOC " . . . which allowed for improved coordination of conferences and meetings within the UN system." However, in noting that some locations of meetings were not yet finalized, as well as the dates of the meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the

Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, Ms. Shearouse stated " . . . we trust that the final calendar will reflect the relevant decisions of the General Assembly concerning these meetings and that in all cases the terms of resolutions 40/243 and 43/422 will be honored."

With regard to utilization of conference services by UN organs, Ms. Shearouse indicated the concern of the U.S. Delegation that many UN bodies still do not make effective use of conference-servicing resources. Commenting on the actions taken by the Committe on Conferences on this matter, Ms. Shearouse noted

> . . . while we support the decision of the Committee to continue its letter campaign to those bodies which have historically underutilized scheduled conference services, encouraging them to make fuller use of them, we regret that the Committee was not prepared, once again, to take decisive action and adjust the level of resources made available to these bodies. In this respect, we would like to see a direct correlation drawn between the preparation of the calendar of conferences and meetings and the level of utilization of conference-servicing resources of the bodies . . . it is imperative that UN organs recognize the need for, and strive toward, a more efficient use of conference resources.

With regard to control and limitation of documentation, Ms. Shearouse noted "with appreciation" the decision of the Board of Trustees of UNITAR to discontinue its request for summary records: ". . . the Committee on Conferences must maintain as a goal the reduction in use of meeting records, which are generally quite expensive, to the absolute minimum."

Other comments made by Ms. Shearouse concerned two reports prepared by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on the representation of organizations of the UN system at conferences and meetings, and the report of the Secretary General (document A/44/222) which calls for a review of the Department of Conference Services. Both the JIU reports and the report of the Secretary General were commented on favorably by Ms. Shearouse. With respect to the latter, she noted that the Committee on Conferences should play a leading role in the review of the Department of Conference Services, " . . . as it is the oversight body for conference-servicing activities."

A last point made by Ms. Shearouse concerned the question of the implementation of subparagraph 4 (f) of the mandate of the Committee on Conferences which entrusts the Committee with a role in coordinating conferences within the UN system. She stated, " . . . while my delegation does not object to the Committee seeking the views of the Administrative Committee on Coordination with respect to this question, we do not believe the Committee on Conferences should be usurped by the ACC. We believe there is a vital role for the Committee on Conferences with respect to this question." In her concluding remarks, Ms. Shearouse indicated that the U.S. Delegation attached great importance to the work of the Committee on Conferences and that " . . . the Committee has the potential to influence, for the better, the overall management of conference-servicing resources." The U.S.

Delegation was prepared to support in the Fifth Committee the draft resolution contained in the report of the Committee on Conferences.

Reflecting the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences, the Fifth Committee, on December 19, adopted by consensus the draft resolution titled "Pattern of conferences." The Fifth Committee's draft resolution was formally adopted as resolution 44/196 by consensus decision of the General Assembly on December 21.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), a 15-member body of recognized experts,* is responsible for making recommendations on salaries, allowances, and other benefits and conditions of service for employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The Commission was in session three times, meeting in New York for 4 days (second special session), in Vienna for 3 weeks (29th session), and then again in New York for 4 weeks (30th session). The Fifth Committee considered the ICSC's 15th annual report at seven meetings between November 3 and December 19. Informal consultations preceded the introduction of the draft resolution to the full Fifth Committee.

The three sessions of the ICSC focused primarily on the results of the comprehensive review of the compensation program for UN-system professional employees. This review was assigned by the 42nd General Assembly—the ICSC was given 2 years in which to assess the entire program of pay, benefits and allowances and initiate recommendations for improving the system. The framework within which the ICSC was directed to keep its recommendations was that: (1) overall costs should, as far as possible, be comparable to the current system; (2) the Noblemaire principle should remain the key philosophical base to the system; (3) the U.S. Civil Service should continue to serve as the comparator; (4) a single worldwide salary scale should be used; and (5) incentives for mobility and hardship should be enhanced.

The first session (second special) in 1989 was devoted to the organization of future sessions. Guidelines were adopted that supplemented work methods approved at the 27th and 28th sessions. During the second session, a preliminary review was made of working group findings. The third session continued this review and took final decisions.

The General Assembly approved most of the ICSC proposals (some with modifications recommended by the Fifth Committee) to improve conditions of service for the staff in the professional and higher categories. Most key changes to the current system were authorized effective July 1, 1990. These include, *inter alia*, implementation of an increase in net salary plus post adjustment by an average 5 percent in New York with somewhat varying amounts in other locations, establishment of a floor salary and elimination of regressivity and negative post adjustments, improvements in the methodology for calculating margin, realignments in the structure of the salary schedule, simplification of the methodology for determining post adjustments and improvements to conditions of service in the field via a mobility and hardship allowance matrix.

---

*Claudia Cooley, Associate Director for Personnel Systems and Oversight of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, was the U.S. member in 1989.

Other recommendations approved by the General Assembly were: to request the Secretary General to follow up with member states that had not provided information he requested on supplementary payments and deductions; to request the Secretary General and executive heads of the specialized agencies to take steps to end these practices; and to request the Secretary General, together with concerned parties, to review the functioning of the ICSC.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 44/198 on the report of the International Civil Service Commission.

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Various personnel questions were considered at 10 meetings of the Fifth Committee between November 3 and December 14. Two resolutions eventually were adopted without a vote on December 19.

The first resolution comprised four sections: Composition of the Secretariat; Administration of justice in the Secretariat; Improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat; and Mandatory age of separation for new staff members. (Resolution 44/185.)

The section on composition of the Secretariat primarily dealt with member state concerns that there should be adequate representation of member states in professional posts subject to geographical distribution, including those in the upper echelons. The Secretary General was urged to maximize his efforts to recruit nationals from under-represented and unrepresented member states and to take steps to ensure at senior and policy formulation levels of the Secretariat equitable representation of member states, especially by developing countries and member states with inadequate representation at those levels. Further, he was requested to ensure that staff reductions implemented based on previous resolutions do not adversley affect geographic distribution of posts, especially at senior levels. Regarding other matters, the Secretary General was urged to complete his efforts toward developing a comprehensive career development plan and also to complete work on the development of a methodology for holding national competitive exams at the P-3 level. (Resolution 44/185 A.)

The administration of justice within the UN Secretariat has for several years been strongly criticized by both staff and member states for its cumbersome procedures, over-elaborate machinery and resultant long delays in reaching decisions. The Secretary General reported to the Assembly in 1989 that efforts made to streamline the system have resulted in reducing further the backlog of cases before the Joint Appeals Board in New York and in other UN cities. In the section of the resolution on administration of justice in the Secretariat, the General Assembly welcomed improvements made to the internal justice system. Further, the Assembly requested that the Secretary General proceed to implement, effective January 1, 1990, a revised set of disciplinary rules designed to be more transparent and efficient. (Resolution 44/185 B.)

The section of the resolution dealing with women focused on their status in the UN Secretariat. It echoed earlier resolutions urging the Secretary General to make greater efforts to employ more women, especially in higher grades and from a wider range of countries (particularly the developing countries). It urged the Secretary General to strengthen his efforts to achieve the goal of filling 30 percent of posts subject to geographic distribution with women by 1990. Further, it requested that member states support the Secretary General's efforts by nominating more women candidates and by encouraging women to apply for such posts. (Resolution 44/185 C.)

The last section of the first resolution approved 62 (an increase from 60) as the mandatory age of separation for staff members appointed on or after January 1, 1990, with age 60 retained as the mandatory age of separation for staff currently in service. (Resolution 44/185 D.) This change was made to harmonize with the UN Joint Staff Pension Board's recommendation to increase the normal retirement age to 62.

The second resolution adopted by the Assembly, which concerned the privileges and immunities of international civil servants, was very similar to resolutions adopted in earlier years. It reiterated the Assembly's deep concern for the safety of international civil servants in all the organizations of the UN system, deplored the growing number of cases in which staff have been placed in jeopardy, and called on member states to respect the privileges and immunities of the officials concerned. (Resolution 44/186.)

UN PENSION SYSTEM

The UN Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF) was established in 1949 to provide retirement, death, disability and related benefits for employees of the United Nations and other participating organizations in the Fund. There are 16 international organizations in the Fund and about 55,600 participants. The Fund has assets of approximately $8.2 billion. The UNJSPF is administered through the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

The Board held its 38th session in July at UN Headquarters in New York. The major items discussed were the actuarial valuation of the Fund, ways to improve the actuarial balance of the Fund and arrangements for the comprehensive review (scheduled for 1990) of methodology used to determine pensionable remuneration.

The Board's report recommended several ways to improve the actuarial balance of the Fund, including: (1) increasing the normal retirement age from 60 to 62 for participants who enter or reenter the Fund on or after January 1, 1990 (for existing participants, 60 would be retained as the normal retirement age); (2) effective January 1, 1990, increasing the rate of contribution from 7.5 percent to 7.9 percent for participants and from 15.0 percent to 15.8 percent for employers; and (3) revising early and deferred retirement provisions for participants who enter or reenter the Fund on or after January 1, 1990.

The Board also recommended, *inter alia*, modifying the procedure for adjusting pensionable remuneration pending the comprehensive review on this matter scheduled for 1990.

The Fifth Committee considered the Board's report at six meetings from November 3 to December 19. The General Assembly adopted the Board's recommendations without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 44/199.)

EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICANS

Americans are employed throughout the United Nations, the specialized agencies and IAEA, in both the professional and general services categories.

The following table shows Americans employed in these organizations or specialized agencies and IAEA, as of December 31, 1989.

AMERICANS EMPLOYED IN THE UNITED NATIONS, SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA — 12/31/89

Organization	Total Employees	Professionals		U.S.	Gen. Services		U.S.
		Total	U.S.	Percent	Total	U.S.	Percent
UN-Secretariat	13703	3791	506	13.35	9912	1057	10.66
UNDP	6636	1594	179	11.23	5042	188	3.73
UNHCR	2108	683	54	7.91	1425	15	1.05
UNICEF	4478	1633	133	8.14	2845	144	5.06
FAO	5868	2264	177	7.82	3604	61	1.69
IAEA	1728	684	109	15.94	1044	50	4.79
ICAO	798	298	23	7.72	500	6	1.20
IFAD	203	83	8	9.64	120	10	8.33
ILO	1654	643	50	7.78	1011	14	1.38
IMO	320	133	3	2.26	187	2	1.07
ITU	881	418	18	4.31	463	9	1.94
UNIDO	1190	425	43	10.12	765	36	4.71
UPU	145	61	1	1.64	84	0	0.00
WHO*	4394	1408	179	12.71	2986	44	1.47
WIPO	331	112	3	2.68	219	6	2.74
WMO	230	106	8	7.55	124	1	0.81

* Includes IARC.

In the UN Secretariat, there are many Americans in management and administrative positions, including some at senior levels. They are also represented, but are less numerous, in the political, economic and social areas. In the specialized agencies and IAEA, Americans are found both at headquarters and the field, in policy making and operational positions.

In order to achieve a geographically balanced workforce, the UN Secretariat and some of the agencies have developed formulas, based on factors such as assessed contribution and population, to establish a "desirable range" of professional positions for each member state. A relatively small number of these positions for example, interpreters and translators, are excluded from this process; which are best recruited from countries where the required language is spoken.

In terms of these formulas, Americans are adequately represented only in the UN Secretariat in New York. In most of the specialized agencies and IAEA located overseas, however, the number of American staff is below—often far below–-the quota or "desirable range" specified for the United States.

UN PERSONNEL STATISTICS
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL STAFF—12/89

UN AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES WITH GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS

Organization	Percentage of U.S. Contribution to Assessed Budgets	Posts Subject to Geographic Distribution Authorized /	Filled	U.S Desirable Range or Quota	Americans in Posts Subject to Geographic Distribution
United Nations	25.00	2,700	2,594	327 - 442	389
FAO	25.00	N/A	824	155- 260	74
ICAO	25.00	298	224	49	20
ILO	25.00	N/A	643	122 - 163	50
UNIDO	25.00	N/A	332	49 - 66	35
WHO	25.00	1,430	1,206	175 - 238	170
WIPO	6.43	87	90	6 - 8*	4
IAEA	25.14	N/A	609	129 - 215	99

UN SPECIALIZED AGENCIES WITHOUT SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS

Organization	Percentage of U.S. Contribution to Assessed Budgets	All Professional Posts	Americans in Professional Posts	
			Number	Percent
IFAD	Variable	83	8	9.63
IMO	5.53	133	3	2.25
ITU	7.67	286	18	6.29
UPU	5.11	61	1	1.63
WMO	25.00	106	8	7.54

---

*Desirable range is for North America. Canada has one national employee.

We attribute this under-representation in the specialized agencies to various factors:

— Insufficient efforts on the part of UN agency heads to redress geographic imbalances and take the necessary steps to achieve the desired geographic distribution. The Secretariats of the UN agencies are under continuous pressure from other members to appoint more of their nationals and there remains a system-wide emphasis on hiring more nationals from developing countries.

— Geographic and language constraints. With most of the specialized agencies headquartered in Europe, distance and language requirements make it more difficult for Americans to compete and easier for Europeans. The British, French and Dutch, for example, are over-represented in many of these agencies.

— UN organizations have difficulty competing with U.S. private industry salaries and career opportunities, and have difficulty attracting and retaining American candidates. This is especially true in fields such as law, medicine, scientific research, engineering and business administration.

Americans are seriously under-represented in four of the larger UN organizations: FAO, ILO, ICAO and UNHCR. Furthermore, in these agencies Americans were not hired or promoted during 1989 at rates which would measurably increase U.S. representation.

To help UN agencies balance their staffs, the U.S. Government recruits qualified American citizens to compete for UN job openings. For example, in 1989 the Department of State monitored over 1,200 vacancies and recruited and submitted candidates for several hundred. Other Federal Agencies recruited candidates for other, generally more technical positions. Unfortunately, during the past 3 years staffing efforts have been constrained because of budgetary problems within the UN system, due in part to growing arrearages in U.S. payments. These payment shortfalls also adversely affected our ability to lobby for U.S. candidates. With fewer vacancies and redeployment of staff due to budget pressures, a large share of positions continue to be filled from within the agencies.

As the United States restores funding to most UN agencies, we expect that agencies will begin filling more positions externally, which should open up more positions to international competition. We have urged all agencies in which American under-representation is severe to address the problem by setting elevated hiring goals for Americans. Also, we are working closely with the United Nations to increase the number of professional women in its ranks to a level of 30 percent by the end of 1990. This should provide to qualified American women a greater opportunity to become part of the UN system during the coming years.

Appendix 1

Address by President Bush at the 44th Regular Session of the General Assembly

Statement before the 44th session of the UN General Assembly on September 25, 1989.

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates of the United Nations. I am honored to speak to you today as you open the 44th session of the General Assembly.

I would like to congratulate Joseph Garba of Nigeria—a distinguished diplomat—on his election as President of this session of the General Assembly, and I wish him success in his presidency. I feel a great personal pleasure on this occasion. This is a homecoming for me. The memories of my time here in 1971 and 1972 are still with me today—the human moments—the humorous moments—that are part of even the highest undertaking.

Let me share one story—from one of the many sessions of the Security Council. I was 45 minutes late getting to the meeting—and all 45 minutes were filled by the first speaker to take the floor. When I walked in and took my seat, the speaker paused and said with great courtesy: "I welcome the Permanent Representative of the United States, and now—for his benefit—I will start my speech again—from the beginning." At that moment, differences of alliance and ideology didn't matter. The universal groan that went up around the table—from every member present—and the laughter that followed—united us all.

Today, I would like to begin by recognizing the current Permanent Representatives with whom I served: Roberto Martinez-Ordonez, Blaise Rabetafika, Permanent Observer John Dube. It's wonderful to look around and see so many familiar faces—foreign ministers, members of the Secretariat, delegates. And, of course, Mr. Secretary General, you were Permanent Representative for your country when we served together. And Under-Secretary, Abby Farah, you were a Permanent Representative back then too. It's an honor to be back with you in this historic hall.

The United Nations was established 44 years ago upon the ashes of war—and amidst great hopes. And the United Nations can do great things. No, the United Nations isn't perfect. It's not a panacea for the world's problems. But it is a vital forum where the nations of the world seek to replace conflict with consensus—and it must remain a forum for peace.

The United Nations is moving closer to that ideal. And it has the support of the United States of America. In recent years—certainly since my time here—the war of words that has often echoed in this chamber is giving way to a new mood. We've seen a welcome shift—from polemics to peacekeeping.

The UN Peacekeeping Forces are on duty right now, and over more than 700 peacekeepers have given their lives in service to the United Nations. Today, I want to remember one of these soldiers of peace—an American on a mission of peace under the UN flag—on a mission for all the world. A man of unquestioned bravery and unswerving dedication to the UN ideal: Lieutenant Colonel William Richard Higgins.

I call on the General Assembly to condemn the murder of this soldier of peace and call on those responsible to return his remains to his family. And let us all right now—right here—rededicate ourselves and our nations to the cause that Colonel Higgins served so selflessly.

The founders of this historic institution believed that it was here that the nations of the world might come to agree that law—not force—shall govern. And the United Nations can play a fundamental role in the central issue of our time. For today, there is an idea at work around the globe—an idea of undeniable force. That idea is: freedom.

Freedom's advance is evident everywhere. In Central Europe: In Hungary—where state and society are now in the midst of a movement toward political pluralism and a free market economy—where the barrier that once enforced an unnatural division between Hungary and its neighbors to the West has been torn down—torn down and replaced by a new hope for the future—new hope in freedom.

We see freedom at work in Poland, where, in deference to the will of the people, the Communist Party has relinquished its monopoly on power. And in the Soviet Union the world hears the voices of people no longer afraid to speak out, or to assert the right to rule themselves.

But freedom's march is not confined to a single continent—or to the developed world alone. We see the rise of freedom in Latin America, where one by one dictatorships are giving way to democracy. We see it on the continent of Africa, where more and more nations see in the system of free enterprise salvation for economies crippled by excessive state control. East and West, North and South, on every continent, on every horizon, we can see the outlines of a new world of freedom.

Of course, freedom's work remains unfinished. The trend we see is not yet universal. Some regimes still stand against the tide. Some rulers still deny the right of the people to govern themselves. But now, the power of prejudice and despotism is challenged. Never before have these regimes stood so isolated and alone, so out of step with the steady advance of freedom.

Today, we are witnessing an ideological collapse—the demise of the totalitarian idea of the omniscient, all-powerful state. There are many reasons for this collapse. But in the end, one fact alone explains what we see today: Advocates of the totalitarian idea saw its triumph written in the laws of history. They failed to see the love of freedom written in the human heart.

Two hundred years ago today, the U.S. Congress proposed a Bill of Rights—fundamental freedoms belonging to every individual, rights no government can deny. Those same rights have been recognized in this congress of nations—in the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "A common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations."

From where we stand—on the threshold of this new world of freedom—the trend is clear enough. If, for those who write the history of our times, the Twentieth Century is remembered as the century of the state, the Twenty-First must be an era of emancipation—the age of the individual.

Make no mistake: nothing can stand in the way of freedom's march. There will come a day when freedom is seen the world over to be the universal birthright of every man and woman, of every race and walk of life. Even under the worst of circumstances, at the darkest of times, freedom has always remained alive—a distant dream, perhaps, but always alive.

Today, that dream is no longer distant. For the first time, for millions around the world, a new world of freedom is within reach. Today is freedom's moment. You see, the possibility now exists for the creation of a true community of nations—built on shared interests and ideals. A true community—a world where free governments and free markets meet the rising desire of the people to control their own destiny: To live in dignity, and to exercise freely their fundamental human rights. It is time we worked together to deliver that destiny into the hands of men and women everywhere.

Our challenge is to strengthen the foundations of freedom—encourage its advance, and face our most urgent challenges. The global challenges of the Twenty-First Century are: Economic health, environmental well-being, and the great questions of war and peace.

First is global economic growth. During this decade, a number of developing nations have moved into the ranks of the world's most advanced economies—all of them—each and every one—powered by the engine of free enterprise. In the decade ahead, others can join their ranks. But for many nations barriers stand in the way. In the case of some countries, these are obstacles of their own making: Unneeded restrictions and regulations that act as dead weights on their own economies and obstacles to foreign trade. But other barriers to growth exist, and those too require effective action. Too many developing countries struggle today under a burden of debt that makes growth all but impossible. The nations of the world deserve a better opportunity to achieve a measure of control over their own economic and build better lives for their own people.

The approach the United States has put forward—the Brady Plan—will help these nations reduce that debt and at the same time encourage the free market reforms that will fuel growth. In just 2 days I will be speaking to the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. I'll discuss there in more detail steps our nations can take in dealing with the debt problem. But I can say now: the new world of freedom is not a world where a few nations live in comfort, while others live in want.

The power of commerce is a force for progress. Open markets are the key to continued growth in the developing world. Today, the United States buys over one half of the manufactured exports that all the developing nations combined sell to the industrialized world. It's time for the other advanced economies to follow suit—to create expanded opportunities for trade. I believe we'll learn in the century ahead that many nations of the world have barely begun to tap their true potential for development. The free market and its fruits are not the special preserve of a few. They are a harvest everyone can share.

Beyond the challenge of global growth lies another issue of global magnitude: the environment. No line drawn on a map can stop the advance of pollution. Threats to our environment have become an international problem. We must develop an international approach to urgent environmental issues, one that seeks common solutions to common problems. The United Nations is already at work on the question of global warming and on efforts to prevent oil spills and other disasters from fouling our seas and the air we breathe. And I will tell you now: The United States will do its part. We've committed ourselves to the worldwide phase-out of all chlorofluorocarbons by the year 2000. We've proposed amending our clean air act to ensure clean air for our citizens within a single generation. We've banned the import of ivory to protect the elephant and rhinoceros from the human predators who exterminate them for profit. And we have begun to explore ways to work with other nations—with the major industrialized democracies, in Poland and in Hungary—to make common cause for the sake of our environment. The environment belongs to all of us. In our new world of freedom, the world's citizens must enjoy this common trust for generations to come.

Global economic growth and the stewardship of our planet both are critical issues. But as always, questions of war and peace must be paramount to the United Nations. We must move forward to limit—and eliminate—weapons of mass destruction. Five years ago, at the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, I presented a U.S. draft treaty outlawing chemical weapons. Since then, progress has been made, but time is running out. The threat is growing. More than 20 nations now possess chemical weapons or the capability to produce them. And these horrible weapons are now finding their way into regional conflicts. This is unacceptable. For the sake of mankind, we must halt and reverse this threat. Today, I want to announce steps the United States is ready to take—steps to rid the world of these truly terrible weapons—toward a treaty that will ban, eliminate, all chemical weapons from the earth 10 years from the day it is signed.

This initiative contains three major elements: First, in the first 8 years of a chemical weapons treaty, the United States is ready to destroy nearly all—98 percent—of our chemical weapons stockpile—provided the Soviet Union joins the ban. I think they will.

Second, we are ready to destroy all of our chemical weapons—100 percent, every one—within 10 years, once all nations capable of building chemical weapons sign the total ban treaty.

And third, the United States is ready to begin now. We'll eliminate more than 80 percent of our stockpile—even as we work to complete a treaty—if the Soviet Union joins us in cutting chemical weapons to an equal level, and we agree on the conditions—including inspections—under which stockpiles are destroyed.

We know that monitoring a total ban on chemical weapons will be a challenge. But the knowledge we've gained from our recent arms control experience—our accelerating research in this area—makes me believe we can achieve the level of verification that gives us confidence to go forward with the ban. The world has lived too long in the shadow of chemical warfare. Let us act together—beginning today—to rid the earth of this scourge.

We are serious about achieving conventional arms reductions as well. That's why we tabled new proposals just last Thursday at the conventional forces in Europe negotiations in Vienna, proposals that demonstrate our commitment to act rapidly to ease military tensions in Europe and move the nations of that continent one step closer to their common destiny: A Europe whole and free.

The United States is convinced that open and innovative measures can move disarmament forward—and also ease international tensions. That is the idea behind the Open Skies proposal about which the Soviets have now expressed a positive attitude. It is the idea behind the Open Lands proposal—permitting, for the first time ever, free travel for all Soviet and American diplomats throughout each other's countries. Openness is the enemy of mistrust, and every step toward a more open world is a step toward the new world we seek.

And let me make this comment on our meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze over the past few days. I am very pleased by the progress we made. The Soviet Union removed a number of obstacles to progress on conventional and strategic arms reductions. We reached agreements in principle on issues from verification to nuclear testing. And, of course, we agreed to a summit in the spring or early summer of 1990.

Each of these achievements is important in its own right, but they are more important still as signs of a new attitude that prevails between the United States and U.S.S.R.

Serious differences remain, but the willingness to deal constructively and candidly with those differences is news that we—and indeed the world—must welcome.

We have not entered an era of perpetual peace. The threats to peace that nations face may today be changing, but they have not vanished. In fact, in a number of regions around the world a dangerous combination is now emerging: regimes armed with old and unappeasable animosities—and modern weapons of mass destruction. This development will raise the stakes whenever war breaks out. Regional conflict may well threaten world peace as never before.

The challenge of preserving peace is a personal one for all of you here in this hall. Mr. Secretary General, I know you have made it your own. The United Nations can be a mediator—a forum where parties in conflict come in search of peaceful solutions. For the sake of peace, the United Nations must redouble its support for the peace efforts now underway in regions of conflict all over the world. And let me assure you: The United States is determined to take an active role in settling regional conflicts. Sometimes, our role in regional disputes is and will be highly public. Sometimes, like many of you, we are quietly behind the scenes. But always we are working for positive change and lasting peace.

Our world faces other, less conventional threats—no less dangerous to international peace and stability. Illegal drugs are a menace to social order and a source of human misery wherever they gain a foothold. The nations who suffer this scourge must join forces in the fight. And we are. Let me salute the commitment and extraordinary courage of one country in particular—Colombia—where we are working with the people and their President, Virgilio Barco, to put the drug cartels out of business, and bring the drug lords to justice.

Finally, we must join forces to combat the threat of terrorism. Every nation—and the United Nations—must send the outlaws of the world a clear message: Hostage-taking and the terror of random violence are methods that cannot win the world's approval. Terrorism of any kind is repugnant to all values a civilized world holds in common. And make no mistake: Terrorism is a means that no end—no matter how just—can sanctify.

Whatever the challenge, freedom greatly raises the chances of our success. Freedom's moment is a time of hope for all the world. Because freedom—once set in emotion—takes on a momentum of its own. As I said the day I assumed the Presidency: "We don't have to talk late into the night about which form of government is better." We know that free government—democracy—is best. I believe that is the hard-won truth of our time—the unassailable fact that still stands at the end of a century of great struggle and human suffering. And this is true not because all our differences must give way to democracy, but because democracy makes room for all our differences. In democracy, diversity finds its common home.

At the very heart of the democratic ideal is respect—for freedom of belief, freedom of thought and action in all its diversity—for human rights. The world has experienced enough of the ideologies that have promised to remake man in some new and better image. We've seen the colossal tragedies and dashed hopes. We know now that freedom and democracy hold the answers. What men and nations want is the freedom to live by their own lights, and a chance to prosper in peace.

When I began today, I spoke to you about peacekeeping. I want to speak to you now about peacemaking. We must bring peace to the people who have never known its blessings. There's a painting that hangs on the wall of my office in the White House. It pictures President Lincoln and his generals meeting near the end of a war that remains the bloodiest in American history. Outside, at that moment, a battle rages. And yet what we see in the distance is a rainbow—a symbol of hope, of the passing of the storm. That painting is called the Peacemakers. For me, it is a constant reminder that our struggle—the struggle for peace—is a struggle blessed by hope.

I do remember sitting in this hall. I remember the mutual respect among all of us proudly serving as representatives. I remember the almost endless speeches, Security Council sessions, the receptions and receiving lines, the formal meetings of this Assembly, and the informal discussions in the Delegates Lounge. And I remember something more, something beyond the frantic pace and sometimes frustrating experiences of daily life here: the heartbeat of the United Nations—the quiet conviction that we could make the world more peaceful, more free.

What we sought then, now lies within our reach. I ask each of you here in this hall: Can we not bring a unity of purpose to the United Nations? Can we not make this new world of freedom the common destiny we seek? I believe we can. I know we must. My solemn wish today is that here—among the United Nations—that spirit will take hold, and that all men and all nations will make freedom's moment their own.

Thank you, God bless you and may God bless the work of the United Nations.

Appendix 2

Principal Organs of the United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly is composed of all 159 members. They are:

Member	Date of Admission	Member	Date of Admission
Afghanistan	Nov. 19, 1946	China*	Oct. 24, 1945
Albania	Dec. 14, 1955	Colombia	Nov. 5, 1945
Algeria	Oct. 8, 1962	Comoros	Nov. 12, 1975
Angola	Dec. 1, 1976	Congo	Sept. 20, 1960
Antigua and Barbuda	Nov. 11, 1981	Costa Rica	Nov. 2, 1945
Argentina	Oct. 24, 1945	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	Sept. 20, 1960
Australia	Nov. 1, 1945	Cuba	Oct. 24, 1945
Austria	Dec. 14, 1955	Cyprus	Sept. 20, 1960
Bahamas	Sept. 18, 1973	Czechoslovakia	Oct. 24, 1945
Bahrain	Sept. 21, 1971	Denmark	Oct. 24, 1945
Bangladesh	Sept. 17, 1974	Djibouti	Sept. 20, 1977
Barbados	Dec. 9, 1966	Dominica	Dec. 18, 1978
Belgium	Dec. 27, 1945	Dominican Republic	Oct. 24, 1945
Belize	Sept. 25, 1981	Ecuador	Dec. 21, 1945
Benin	Sept. 20, 1960	Egypt	Oct. 24, 1945
Bhutan	Sept. 21, 1971	El Salvador	Oct. 24, 1945
Bolivia	Nov. 14, 1945	Equatorial Guinea	Nov. 12, 1968
Botswana	Oct. 17, 1966	Ethiopia	Nov. 13, 1945
Brazil	Oct. 24, 1945	Fiji	Oct. 13, 1970
Brunei Darussalam	Sept. 21, 1984	Finland	Dec. 14, 1955
Bulgaria	Dec. 14, 1955	France	Oct. 24, 1945
Burkina Faso	Sept. 20, 1960	Gabon	Sept. 20, 1960
Burundi	Sept. 18, 1962	Gambia	Sept. 21, 1965
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945	German Democratic Republic	Sept. 18, 1973
Cameroon	Sept. 20, 1960	Germany, Federal Republic of	Sept. 18, 1973
Canada	Nov. 9, 1945	Ghana	Mar. 8, 1957
Cape Verde	Sept. 16, 1975	Grenada	Sept. 17, 1974
Central African Republic	Sept. 20, 1960	Greece	Oct. 25, 1945
Chad	Sept. 20, 1960	Guatemala	Nov. 21, 1945
Chile	Oct. 24, 1945	Guinea	Dec. 12, 1958

---

*By resolution 2758 (XXVI) of October 25, 1971, the General Assembly decided "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations."

Guinea-Bissau	Sept. 17, 1974
Guyana	Sept. 20, 1966
Haiti	Oct. 24, 1945
Honduras	Dec. 17, 1945
Hungary	Dec. 14, 1955
Iceland	Nov. 19, 1946
India	Oct. 30, 1945
Indonesia	Sept. 28, 1950
Iran	Oct. 24, 1945
Iraq	Dec. 21, 1945
Ireland	Dec. 14, 1955
Israel	May 11, 1949
Italy	Dec. 14, 1955
Jamaica	Sept. 18, 1962
Japan	Dec. 18, 1956
Jordan	Dec. 14, 1955
Kampuchea	Dec. 14, 1955
Kenya	Dec. 16, 1963
Kuwait	May 14, 1963
Laos	Dec. 14, 1955
Lebanon	Oct. 24, 1945
Lesotho	Oct. 17, 1966
Liberia	Nov. 2, 1945
Libya	Dec. 14, 1955
Luxembourg	Oct. 24, 1945
Madagascar	Sept. 20, 1960
Malawi	Dec. 1, 1964
Malaysia	Sept. 17, 1957
Maldives	Sept. 21, 1965
Mali	Sept. 28, 1960
Malta	Dec. 1, 1964
Mauritania	Oct. 27, 1961
Mauritius	Apr. 24, 1968
Mexico	Nov. 7, 1945
Mongolia	Oct. 27, 1961
Morocco	Nov. 12, 1956
Mozambique	Sept. 16, 1975
Myanmar (Burma)	Apr. 19, 1948
Nepal	Dec. 14, 1955
Netherlands	Dec. 10, 1945
New Zealand	Oct. 24, 1945
Nicaragua	Oct. 24, 1945
Niger	Sept. 20, 1960
Nigeria	Oct. 7, 1960
Norway	Nov. 27, 1945
Oman	Oct. 7, 1971
Pakistan	Sept. 30, 1947
Panama	Nov. 13, 1945
Papua New Guinea	Oct. 10, 1975
Paraguay	Oct. 24, 1945
Peru	Oct. 31, 1945
Philippines	Oct. 24, 1945
Poland	Oct. 24, 1945
Portugal	Dec. 14, 1955
Qatar	Sept. 21, 1971
Romania	Dec. 14, 1955
Rwanda	Sept. 18, 1962
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Sept. 23, 1983
Saint Lucia	Sept. 18, 1979
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Sept. 16, 1980
Samoa	Dec. 15, 1976
Sao Tome and Principe	Sept. 16, 1975
Saudi Arabia	Oct. 24, 1945
Senegal	Sept. 28, 1960
Seychelles	Sept. 21, 1976
Sierra Leone	Sept. 27, 1961
Singapore	Sept. 21, 1965
Solomon Islands	Sept. 19, 1978
Somalia	Sept. 20, 1960
South Africa	Nov. 7, 1945
Spain	Dec. 14, 1955
Sri Lanka	Dec. 14, 1955
Sudan	Nov. 12, 1956
Suriname	Dec. 4, 1975
Swaziland	Sept. 24, 1968
Sweden	Nov. 19, 1946
Syria	Oct. 24, 1945
Tanzania	Dec. 14, 1961
Thailand	Dec. 16, 1946
Togo	Sept. 20, 1960
Trinidad and Tobago	Sept. 18, 1962
Tunisia	Nov. 12, 1956
Turkey	Oct. 24, 1945
Uganda	Oct. 25, 1962
Ukrainian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
U.S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
United Arab Emirates	Dec. 9, 1971
United Kingdom	Oct. 24, 1945
United States	Oct. 24, 1945
Uruguay	Dec. 18, 1945
Vanuatu	Sept. 15, 1981
Venezuela	Nov. 15, 1945
Vietnam	Sept. 20, 1977
Yemen (Aden)	Dec. 14, 1967
Yemen (Sanaa)	Sept. 30, 1947
Yugoslavia	Oct. 24, 1945
Zaire	Sept. 20, 1960
Zambia	Dec. 1, 1964
Zimbabwe	Aug. 25, 1980

The 43rd regular session of the General Assembly, which had been suspended December 22, 1988, was resumed February 14–March 7, 1989, to discuss the scale of assessments for the United Nations; the UN Angola Verification Mission; the UN Transition Assistance Group; and development and international economic cooperation. Two resolutions and one decision were adopted at the resumed session. The first resolution provided for the financing of the UN Angola Verification Mission (Resolution 43/231) and the second for the financing of the UN Transition Assistance Group. (Resolution 43/232.) In decision 43/460 the General Assembly decided to convene a special session devoted to international cooperation from April 23–27, 1990.

On April 18–20, 1989, the 43rd General Assembly was resumed again and adopted a decision on the election of a member of the International Court of Justice (Decision 43/327); and a resolution on the question of Palestine. (Resolution 43/233.)

The 43rd General Assembly was resumed briefly July 11, 1989, to consider the scale of assessments, postpone the special session on apartheid until December 1989, and again on September 18, 1989, to formally close the session. The 16th special session of the General Assembly was convened (December 12–14) to consider apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa.

The 44th regular session of the General Assembly convened September 19, 1989, and was suspended December 29, 1989.

The Assembly elected Joseph Nanven Garba (Nigeria) as President and the Chairmen of the Delegations of Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, China, Congo, Costa Rica, France, Gambia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Morocco, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Sudan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States and Zimbabwe as the 21 Vice Presidents.

The Chairmen of the seven Main Committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First Committee (Political and Security) — Adolfo Taylhardat (Venezuela)
Special Political Committee — Guennadi I. Oudovenko (Ukraine)
Second Committee (Economic and Financial) — Ahmed Ghezal (Tunisia)
Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) — Paul Desire Kabore (Burkino Faso)
Fourth Committee (Decolonization) — Robert F. Van Lierop (Vanuatu)
Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) — Ahmad Fathi Al-Masri (Syria)
Sixth Committee (Legal) — Helmut Tuerk (Austria)

The General Committee (steering committee) is composed of the President, the 21 Vice Presidents, and Chairmen of the seven Main Committees.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council is composed of 5 members designated in the Charter as permanent and 10 members elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

Permanent Members: China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.
1989: Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia.
1990: Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Finland

On October 26, 1989, the Assembly elected Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire as members of the Security Council for a 2-year term of office beginning January 1, 1990.

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council is composed of the United States (as administrator of a territory), and the other four Permanent Members of the Security Council (China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom).

The Trusteeship Council held its 19th special session, March 16–17, the 56th session May 15–June 1 and a resumed session August 9, all in New York.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ECOSOC is composed of 54 members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

1989: Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Iran, Norway, Oman, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zaire.
1990: Colombia, Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.
1991: Bahamas, Brazil, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian S.S.R., United States, Zambia.

On November 1, 1989, the General Assembly elected Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burkino Faso, Canada, China, Ecuador, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Jamaica, Mexico, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and Zaire for terms beginning on January 1, 1990.

ECOSOC held its organizational session for 1989 (February 9–10) and its first regular session (May 2–24) in New York. The second regular session of 1989 was held in Geneva (July 5–28).

best copy available

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice consists of 15 members elected by the General Assembly and Security Council for 9-year terms ending February 5 of the year given in parenthesis. The Judges, listed in their order of precedence, are:

Jose Maria Ruda of Argentina (1991), President
Keba Mbaye of Senegal (1991), Vice President
Manfred Lachs of Poland (1994)
Taslim Olawale Elias of Nigeria (1994)
Shigeru Oda of Japan (1994)
Roberto Ago of Italy (1997)
Stephen M. Schwebel of the United States (1997)
Robert Y. Jennings of the United Kingdom (1991)
Mohammed Bedjaoui of Algeria (1997)
Ni Zhengyu of China (1994)
Jens Evensen of Norway (1994)
Nikolai K. Tarassov of the U.S.S.R. (1997)
Gilbert Guillaume of France (1991)
Mohamed Shahabuddeen of Guyana (1997)
Raghunandan Swawp Pathak of India (1991)

pages tightly bound

Appendix 3

United States Missions

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK 1989

The United States is represented by a permanent mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, as transmitted by the Secretary of State. It serves as the channel of communication between the U.S. Government and the UN organs, agencies and commissions at the Headquarters; with the 159 other permanent missions accredited to the United Nations; and with various non-member observer missions. It is also the base of operations for U.S. Delegations to the General Assembly and to other UN bodies when they meet in New York.

The Chief of Mission, who has the rank of Ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and also represents the United States in the Security Council. He or she is assisted by other persons of appropriate title, rank and status, who are appointed by the President.

The mission staff includes specialists in political, economic, social, financial, budgetary, legal, military, public affairs and administrative matters. In 1989 about 150 persons were assigned to the mission by the Department of State and other U.S. departments and agencies.

The staff assists the U.S. Representative in such activities as (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in UN organs and bodies; (2) carrying out consultations, negotiation and liaison with other delegations and the UN Secretariat; (3) preparing policy recommendations to the Department of State; (4) reporting to the Department of State on consultations and developments in the United Nations; (5) discharging U.S. responsibilities as "host government," in particular those arising from the 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.); the International Organizations Immunities Act of 1945, as amended; and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United

Nations, which deal, *inter alia*, with relations of the United Nations, its officials, and delegation members with federal, state and local authorities; (6) carrying out public affairs activities; and (7) planning and administering conference operations.

U.S. MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA

The United States maintains a permanent mission in Geneva under the direction of a U.S. Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, who is accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the UN specialized agencies and other international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. The mission is responsible for the representation of U.S. interests at the UN European headquarters; in UN subsidiary bodies located in Geneva (such as UN Human Rights Commission, UN Conference on Trade and Development, UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Economic Commission for Europe, and the UN Disaster Relief Organization); in the five specialized agencies that have their headquarters in Geneva (International Labor Organization, World Health Organization, World Meteorological Organization, International Telecommunication Union, and World Intellectual Property Organization); and in other international bodies such as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Conference on Disarmament, and the Intergovernmental Organization for Migration. The mission also maintains liaison, as appropriate, with resident delegations of other nations in Geneva, as well as with a large number of nongovernmental or voluntary organizations involved in humanitarian affairs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The mission maintains liaison on a continuing basis with the executive heads and members of secretariats of international bodies, reports on developments relating to them, monitors their programs and budgets, and makes policy and program recommendations to the Department of State.

The mission staff includes economic, political, financial, budgetary, scientific, agricultural, health, public affairs, humanitarian and administrative advisers. In 1989 about 150 Americans, including personnel detailed by U.S. Government departments other than the Department of State, were assigned to the staff, and 108 local employees were hired full time.

The Ambassador often heads or serves as alternate on delegations to large conferences, and other officers of the mission either represent the United States in smaller international meetings or serve on the U.S. Delegations to these.

The Mission supports the U.S.-Soviet bilateral arms control talks held in Geneva, which involve some 200 negotiating and technical personnel.

OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

The United States also maintains a mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations and IAEA in Vienna, an observer mission to UNESCO in Paris, a mission to the UN Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome, a mission to ICAO in Montreal, and a liaison office with UNEP in Nairobi.

Appendix 4

United States Representatives

Permanent Representative and Chief of Mission to the United Nations: Vernon A. Walters (through March 1989); Thomas R. Pickering (from August 1989)

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations: Herbert S. Okun (through August 1989); Alexander F. Watson (from August 1989)

Deputy Permanent Representative to the Security Council: Patricia M. Byrne (through June 1989); Milton James Wilkinson (from August 1989)

Representative on the Economic and Social Council: Harry A. Cahill

Alternate Permanent Representative for Special Political Affairs: Hugh Montgomery (through February 1989); Jonathan Moore (from August 1989)

Representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations: Joseph C. Petrone (through August 1989); Morris B. Abram (from August 1989)

U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Vienna: Michael H. Newlin

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

44th regular session (New York, Sept. 19–Dec. 29)
Representatives: Thomas R. Pickering[*] (Chairman); Alexander F. Watson (Vice-Chairman); Christopher H. Smith; Sam Gejdenson; Pearl Bailey
Alternates: Milton James Wilkinson; Jonathan Moore; Barbara Hackman Franklin; Gary E. MacDougal

16th special session (New York, Dec. 12–14)
Representative: Thomas R. Pickering
Alternate: Alexander F. Watson

---

[*] The Secretary of State, James A. Baker, III, served as chairman of the delegation, *ex officio*, during his presence at the session.

UN Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation
38th session (Vienna, May 8–12)
Representative: Frederick A. Mettler
Alternate: Warren K. Sinclair

Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space
32nd session (New York, June 5–16)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun
Alternate: William J. Lowell

Conference on Disarmament
(Geneva, Feb. 7–Apr. 27; June 13–Aug. 31)
Representative: Max L. Friedersdorf
Deputy Representative: James Granger

Disarmament Commission
11th session, (New York, May 8–31)
Representatives: Herbert S. Okun; Lynn Hansen
Alternate: Alexander Akalovsky

Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations
(New York, Apr. 10–12; June 1)
Representative: Robert B. Rosenstock
Alternate: Douglas B. Stevenson

UN Commission on International Trade Law
22nd session (Vienna, May 16–June 2)
Representative: Peter H. Pfund
Alternate: Paul B. Larsen

Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization
14th session (New York, Mar. 27–Apr. 14; July 5–19)
Representative: Robert Rosenstock
Alternate: Carolyn L. Willson

Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean
(New York, Apr. 10–14; July 5–19)
Representative: Douglas B. Stevenson
Alternate: Ralph Mason

Committee on Conferences
(New York, Aug. 21–29)
Representative: Susan M. Shearouse
Alternate: Michael Michalski

Committee on Information
11th session (New York, Apr. 13–26)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Meridy Lippoldt; Arthur Zegelbone

Ad Hoc Committee on Drafting an International Convention Against Activities of Mercenaries
(New York, Jan. 30–Feb. 17)
Representative: Carolyn L. Willson
Alternate: David A. Balton

Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy
Did not meet in 1989.

SECURITY COUNCIL

Representative: Thomas R. Pickering
Deputies: Alexander F. Watson; Milton James Wilkinson
Alternates: Robert T. Grey, Jr.; Robert B. Rosenstock

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

56th session (New York, May 15–June 2)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Robert M. Immerman; John Kriendler;
Robert B. Rosenstock; Daniel R. Russel

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL AND RELATED BODIES

Organizational session for 1989 (New York, Feb. 8–10)
Representative: Noel L. Gross
Alternate: Harry A. Cahill

1st regular session, 1989 (New York, May 2–26)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; A. Gordon MacArthur;
Juliette McLennan; Albert G. Nahas; Charlotte Ponticelli;
George F. Saddler; Beverly Zweiben

2nd regular session, 1989 (Geneva, July 5–28)
Representative: Harry A. Cahill
Alternate: Joseph C. Petrone

Commission on Human Rights
45th session (Geneva, Jan. 30–Mar. 10)
Representatives *Ex Officio*: Vernon A. Walters;
Richard S. Williamson
Representative: Armando Valladares
Alternates: Marshall J. Breger; David C. Fischer; Joseph C. Petrone

Commission on Narcotic Drugs
33rd session (Vienna, Feb. 6–17)
Representative: Michael H. Newlin
Alternate: Jerrold Mark Dion

Population Commission
25th session (New York, Feb.21–Mar.2)
Representative: Vincent P. Barabba
Alternate: Nancy Ostrander

Commission for Social Development
31st session (Vienna, Mar. 13–22)
Representative: Michael H. Newlin

Statistical Commission
25th session (New York, Feb. 6–15)
Representative: Hermann Habermann
Alternate: Suzann K. Evinger

Commission on Status of Women
33rd session (Vienna, Mar. 29–Apr. 7)
Representative: Maureen Reagan
Alternates: Helen Barnhill; Esther Coopersmith;
Juliette McLennan; Sarah McKenzie

Commission on Transnational Corporations
15th session (New York, Apr. 5–14)
Representative: Robert C. Reis, Jr.
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Joseph Merante;
Roza Pace

Economic Commission for Europe
44th plenary session (Geneva, Apr. 11–21)
Representative: Joseph C. Petrone
Alternate: Bernard Engel

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
45th plenary session (Bangkok, Mar. 27–Apr. 5)
Representative: Daniel O'Donohue
Alternates: Robert B. Duncan; Thomas T. Turqman

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
Did not meet in 1989.

UN Children's Fund
Executive Board (New York, Apr. 17–28)
Representative: Rita Di Martino
Alternates: Claudine B. Cox; Sandra L. Vogelgesang
Executive Board Special Meeting (New York, Dec. 18)
Representatives: Thomas R. Pickering; Rita Di Martino
Alternates: Jonathan Moore; Jane Becker

Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations
(New York, Jan. 23–Feb. 3)
Representative: Steven McGann
Alternates: Kevin Charles; Diane Windeler

Committee for Program and Coordination
29th session (New York, May 8–June 2)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Richard C. Nygard; M. Deborah Wynes

World Food Council
15th session (Cairo, May 22–26)
Representative: Richard Crowder
Alternate: Joan Wallace Dawkins

Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs
27th session (Rome, May 29–June 2)
Representative: Rolland E. Anderson, Jr.
Alternates: Philip L. Christenson; Gerald Monroe
28th session (Rome, Dec. 11–13)
Representative: Philip L. Christenson
Alternates: Mary Chambliss; Gerald Monroe

Committee on Natural Resources
(New York, Mar. 27–Apr. 5)
Representative: Bruce R. Lipin

Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
Executive Committee, 40th session (Geneva, Oct. 5–13)
Representative: Jewel S. Lafontant
Alternates: Morris A. Abram; Princeton N. Lyman

Commission on Human Settlements
12th session (Cartagena, Colombia, Apr. 24–May 3)
Representative: Fredrik A. Hansen
Alternate: Daniel W. Figgins, Jr.; Fredrik A. Hansen

Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development
10th session (New York, Aug. 21–Sept.1)
Representative: Steven McGann

UN Conference on Trade and Development
Trade and Development Board
36th session (Geneva, Oct. 2–13)
Representative: Morris Abram
Alternate: Rod Wright

UN Development Program
Organizational meeting and special session
(New York, Feb. 21–24)
Representative: Noel L. Gross
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Joan Dudik-Gayoso
Governing Council, 36th session (New York, June 5–30)
Representatives: Richard E. Bissell; Nyle C. Brady;
Thaddeus Garrett, Jr.
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Joan Dudik-Gayoso;
Sandra L. Vogelgesang

UN Environment Program
15th session, Governing Council (Nairobi, May 14–26)
Representative: Frederick Bernthal
Alternates: Elinor Constable; Alan Hill; William A. Nitze

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA

UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
Industrial Development Board, (Vienna, June 27–July 7)
Representative: Michael H. Newlin
Alternate: Norman H. Frisbie
Third General Conference: Special Session of IDB
(Vienna, Nov. 20–25)
Representative: Michael H. Newlin
Alternate: John A. Buche

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
25th session: Conference (Rome, Nov. 11–30)
Representative: Clayton Yeutter
Alternates: Ann M. Veneman; Gerald Monroe; John R. Bolton;
Jane E. Becker

International Maritime Organization (IMO)
Assembly: 16th session (London, Oct. 9–20)
Representative: Paul A. Yost, Jr.
Alternate: Mary Ann Kekich; Joel D. Sipes
Council:
62nd session (London, June 5–9)
Representative: J. Anthony Allitto
Alternates: Michael C. Grace; Joel D. Sipes
63rd session (London, Oct. 20)
Representative: Mary Ann Kekich
Alternates: Michael C. Grace; Joel D. Sipes

World Bank Group and International Monetary Fund

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)
U.S. Governor: Nicholas F. Brady
Alternate: Robert T. McCormack
U.S. Executive: E. Patrick Coady
Advisor: Ronald E. Myers

International Development Association (IDA)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD.

International Finance Corporation (IFC)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD.

International Monetary Fund (IMF)
U.S. Governor: Nicholas F. Brady
Alternate: Alan Greenspan

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
Assembly: 27th session (Montreal, Sept. 19–Oct. 6)
Chief Delegate: Edmund P. C. Stohr

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
12th session (Rome, Jan. 23–26)
Representative: Reginald J. Brown
Reconvened 12th session (Rome, June 7)
Representative: Barbara Upton

International Telecommunications Union (ITU)
Plenipotentiary Conference (Nice, May 23–June 29)
Representative: C. Travis Marshall
Alternates: Daniel H. Clare; Michael Fitch;
Harold G. Kimball: Frances S. Urbany
44th session, Administrative Council (Geneva, Jan. 30–Feb. 3)
45th session, Administrative Council (Geneva, June 30)
Representative: Earl S. Barbely

Universal Postal Union (UPU)
Executive Council (Bern, Apr. 10–28)
Advisers: David Balton; Anne B. Patterson;
Bernice A. Powell; Joseph P. Richardson

World Health Organization (WHO)
42nd World Health Assembly (Geneva, May 8–19)
Delegates: Louis W. Sullivan; James O. Mason; John R. Bolton
Alternates: C. Everett Koop; Joseph C. Petrone;
Neil A. Boyer; Nyle C. Brady; Frank E. Young

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
Governing bodies (Geneva, Sept. 25–Oct.4)
Representative: Donald J. Quigg
Alternates: Ralph Oman; Harvey J. Winter

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
WMO Congress did not meet in 1989.

World Tourism Organization (WTO)
8th session, General Assembly (Paris, Aug. 25–Sept. 2)
Representative: Rockwell A. Schnabel
Alternate: Robert Bentley; John R. Bolton;
Mary Ann Kekich; Jean G. O'Brien

International Labor Organization (ILO)
International Labor Conference (Geneva, June 7–28)
Minister: Elizabeth Dole
Also attending: Robert P. Davis; John Sarpy;
Dale Triber Tate; Susan Thigpen
Delegates: Shellyn G. McCaffrey; James Mattson
Alternates: David A. Peterson; Joseph C. Petrone

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
131st session, Executive Board (Paris, May 17–June 23)
132nd session, Executive Board (Paris, Sept. 28–Oct. 13)
25th General Conference (Paris, Oct. 17–Nov. 16)
Principal Observer: Richard T. Miller

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
Board of Governors (Vienna, June 12–16; Sept. 20–22)
Representative: Richard T. Kennedy
Alternate: Michael H. Newlin

Appendix 5

Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations

The scale of assessments for the contributions of member states to the UN budget for the financial years 1989, 1990 and 1991 shall be as follows:

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
Afghanistan	0.01	Cape Verde	0.01
Albania	0.01	Central African Rep.	0.01
Algeria	0.15	Chad	0.01
Angola	0.01	Chile	0.08
Antigua and Barbuda	0.01	China	0.79
Argentina	0.66	Colombia	0.14
Australia	1.57	Comoros	0.01
Austria	0.74	Congo	0.01
Bahamas	0.02	Costa Rica	0.02
Bahrain	0.02	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	0.02
Bangladesh	0.01	Cuba	0.09
Barbados	0.01	Cyprus	0.02
Belgium	1.17	Czechoslovakia	0.66
Belize	0.01	Democratic Kampuchea	0.01
Benin	0.01	Democratic Yemen	0.01
Bhutan	0.01	Denmark	0.69
Bolivia	0.01	Djibouti	0.01
Botswana	0.01	Dominica	0.01
Brazil	1.45	Dominican Republic	0.03
Brunei Darussalam	0.04	Ecuador	0.03
Bulgaria	0.15	Egypt	0.07
Burkina Faso	0.01	El Salvador	0.01
Burundi	0.01	Equatorial Guinea	0.01
Byelorussian S.S.R.	0.33	Ethiopia	0.01
Cameroon	0.01	Fiji	0.01
Canada	3.09	Finland	0.51

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
France	6.25	Oman	0.02
Gabon	0.03	Pakistan	0.06
Gambia	0.01	Panama	0.02
German Dem. Rep.	1.28	Papua New Guinea	0.01
Germany, Fed. Rep. of	8.08	Paraguay	0.03
Ghana	0.01	Peru	0.06
Greece	0.40	Philippines	0.09
Grenada	0.01	Poland	0.56
Guatemala	0.02	Portugal	0.18
Guinea	0.01	Qatar	0.05
Guinea-Bissau	0.01	Romania	0.19
Guyana	0.01	Rwanda	0.01
Haiti	0.01	St. Kitts and Nevis	0.01
Honduras	0.01	St. Lucia	0.01
Hungary	0.21	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01
Iceland	0.03	Samoa	0.01
India	0.37	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01
Indonesia	0.15	Saudi Arabia	1.02
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	0.69	Senegal	0.01
Iraq	0.12	Seychelles	0.01
Ireland	0.18	Sierra Leone	0.01
Israel	0.21	Singapore	0.11
Italy	3.99	Solomon Islands	0.01
Jamaica	0.01	Somalia	0.01
Japan	11.38	South Africa	0.45
Jordan	0.01	Spain	1.95
Kenya	0.01	Sri Lanka	0.01
Kuwait	0.29	Sudan	0.01
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	0.01	Suriname	0.01
Lebanon	0.01	Swaziland	0.01
Lesotho	0.01	Sweden	1.21
Liberia	0.01	Syrian Arab Republic	0.04
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.28	Tanzania, United Rep. of	0.01
Luxembourg	0.06	Thailand	0.09
Madagascar	0.01	Togo	0.01
Malawi	0.01	Trinidad and Tobago	0.05
Malaysia	0.11	Tunisia	0.03
Maldives	0.01	Turkey	0.32
Mali	0.01	Uganda	0.01
Malta	0.01	Ukrainian S.S.R.	1.25
Mauritania	0.01	U.S.S.R.	9.99
Mauritius	0.01	United Arab Emirates	0.19
Myanmar (Burma)	0.01	United Kingdom	4.86
Mexico	0.94	United States	25.00
Mongolia	0.01	Uruguay	0.04
Morocco	0.04	Vanuatu	0.01
Mozambique	0.01	Venezuela	0.57
Nepal	0.01	Vietnam	0.01
Netherlands	1.65	Yemen	0.01
New Zealand	0.24	Yugoslavia	0.46
Nicaragua	0.01	Zaire	0.01
Niger	0.01	Zambia	0.01
Nigeria	0.20	Zimbabwe	0.02
Norway	0.55		
		Grand total	100.00

In accordance with Rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, states which are not members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute toward the 1989, 1990 and 1991 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

Non-member State	Percent	Non-member State	Percent
Holy See	0.01	Nauru	0.01
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	0.05	San Marino	0.01
Korea, Republic of	0.22	Switzerland	1.08
Liechtenstein	0.01	Tonga	0.01
Monaco	0.01	Tuvalu	0.01